DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 179 871	CG 014 012
AUTHOR	Burnham, Brian
TITLE	The Status of Sex Education Programs in the Schools of the York County Board of Education.
INSTITUTION	York County Board of Education, Aurora (Ontario).
PUB DATE	Feb 78
NOTE	146p.: Best copy available: For related document see CG 014 013
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Attitudes: *Elementary Secondary Education; Family Life Education: Foreign Countries; Opinions; *Principals: Program Content: *Resource Materials; *Sex Education: Surveys: Teacher Attitudes; *Teachers
IDENTIFIERS	*Ontario (York County)

ABSTRACT

A sample of teachers and principals was asked to respond to a survey regarding the status of sex education (SE) programs in the schools of York County, Ontario, to determine how students might be better served. Opinions on philosophy, scope, methodology, and outcomes of sex education as well as observations and recommendations were also elicited. Elementary teacher responses do not indicate how well or how much SE is taught, but they do indicate that SE is taught separately and differently to boys and girls. Secondary teachers/principals indicate that SE is offerred in all secondary schools, at most grades. Tables of specific survey responses, as well as appendices which include a recommended book list, film list, and filmstrips for the teaching of Family Life and Sex Education are attached. (BEF)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original document.

ED179871

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

THE STATUS OF SEX EDUCATION PROGRAMS

in the schools of

THE YORK COUNTY BOARD OF EDUCATION

A Survey By

Brian Burnham

Chief Research Officer

The Division of Planning and Development
The York County Board of Education
Aurora, Ontario, L4G 3H2

FEBRUARY 1978

CG 014012

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Stephen Bacsalmasi

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This study required the assistance and cooperation of nearly 300 people.

The teachers and principals who responded to the survey questionnaires constitute about 90 per cent of this total. They gave generously of their time to provide a very substantial data base upon which decisions of considerable importance to young people can be made. It is gratifying that 98 per cent of the staff who were invited to participate were able and willing to take part.

Many teachers and principals shared in the design and testing of the survey instruments: Jim Frame, Head of the Physical and Health Education Department, Langstaff S.S.; Gary Grundy and Dave Kennett, Master Teachers of Physical Education; Mrs. Pat Pollock, Master Teacher of Home Economics; Bill Sanders, Assistant Coordinator of Guidance; Dave Painter, Principal of Stornoway P.S.; Tom Cober, Principal of E.J. Sand Jr. P.S.; and Mike Heptinstall, Vice-Principal, Park Ave. P.S. Russ Seltzer, Coordinator of Guidance, reviewed the Senior Division Guidance guidelines -- which arrived in the middle of this study -- to determine the Ministry's latest views on the role of counsellors with respect to sex education.

A special word of thanks is due Dr. Donal Déiseach, Research Director of the Canadian Education Association, for his invaluable assistance in structuring this study and for his many helpful recommendations as the study report was drafted.

Of much-appreciated assistance in the final drafting of the questionnaires and the report were the suggestions put forth by members of the Sex Education Subcommittee of the Board's Standing Committee on Program: Dr. John M. Denison (chairman); Mrs. Margaret Coburn; and Mr. Norman E. Weller.

These notes of appreciation should not obscure the fact that defects in this study (some if not all are acknowledged in the report) are the sole responsibility of the author.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION

Origin and Nature of Study 1

The Samples Used in the Survey and an Elaboration of the Study's Nature 3

A Limitation of the Survey Method 6

II. FINDINGS OF THE SURVEY OF ELEMENTARY TEACHERS

Guidelines and Policies Followed by Teachers 10

The Respondents and Their Teaching Assignments 14

SE Programming in the Elementary School 17

The Approach to Planning SE Programs 17

Topics Covered by Elementary Teachers 18

Time Given to Sex Education 22

Teacher Training in Sex Education 25

How "Comfortable" Are Teachers with their SE Programs? 26

Resource Persons Used in SE Programs 28

Teaching Aids Used 29

Teachers and Parents 31

Teachers' Views on Scope, Organization, Needs, and Outcomes of SE 35

The Outcomes of Sex Education 40

For Further Thought 43

On Comparisons with the CEA Study 45

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

III. FINDINGS OF THE SURVEY OF ELEMENTARY PRINCIPALS

The Principals and Their Schools 48

Programming Offered 49

Principals' Priorities for SE Topics 51

Principals' Views on Scope, Organization, Needs, and Outcomes of SE 60

Principals' Recommendations for Further Consideration 63

IV. FINDINGS OF THE SURVEY OF SECONDARY TEACHERS

Guidelines and Policies Followed by Teachers 67

The Respondents and Their Teaching Assignments 71

The Approach to Planning SE Programs 73

Topics Covered by Secondary Teachers 74

Time Given to Sex Education 78

Level at which SE Programs are Offered 79

Teacher Training in Sex Education 79

How "Comfortable" Are Teachers with their SE Programs 81

Resource Persons Used in SE Programs 81

Teaching Aids Used 83

Teachers and Parents 85

Teachers' Views on the Scope, Organization, Needs, and Outcomes of SE 87

For Further Thought 92

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

V. FINDINGS OF THE SURVEY OF SECONDARY PRINCIPALS

The Principals and Their Schools 97

Programming Offered 97

Participation Rates 99

Principals' Priorities for SE Topics 100

Principals' Views on Scope, Organization, Needs, and Outcomes of SE 109

INDEX OF TABLES

(TABLES 1 - 12 = ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS)

TABLE 1: The Grade Assignments of Respondents 15

TABLE 2: Teachers Associated With Each Group 16

TABLE 3: Planning Approaches, by Grade Groups 17

TABLE 4: Topics Taught By Grade Group, As Percentages 19

TABLE 5: Time Given For SE, By Grade Group 24

TABLE 6: Formal Training in Sex Education 25

TABLE 7: Degree of Comfort with SE Programming 27

TABLE 8: Resource Persons Used 28

TABLE 9: Teachers' Views on Selected Aspects of SE, As Percentages 36

TABLE 10: Comparison of Samples and Population of Schools 49

TABLE 11: Priority Given By Principals to Selected SE Topics, As Percentages 52

TABLE 12: Principals' Views on Selected Aspects of SE, As Percentages 60

INDEX OF TABLES (continued)

(TABLES 13 - 25 = SECONDARY SCHOOLS)

TABLE 13: Grade Assignments of Survey Respondents 72

TABLE 14: Planning Approaches, By Division 73

TABLE 15: Topics Taught, By Grade Group, As Percentages 74

TABLE 16: Formal Training in Sex Education 80

TABLE 17: Resource Persons Used 82

TABLE 18: Aids, other than books, used to teach SE 84

TABLE 19: How Parents are Informed about SE Programs 85

TABLE 20: Parents' Reaction to SE Programming 86

TABLE 21: Teachers' Views on Selected Aspects of SE 88

TABLE 22: Grades at Which SE Programming Given 98

TABLE 23: Participation Rates as Percentages, By School 99

TABLE 24: Priority Given By Principals to Selected SE Topics 101

TABLE 25: Principals' Views on Selected Aspects of SE 110

APPENDICES

A Survey of Teachers 114

B Survey of Principals 124

C Books Reported To Be Used By Teachers and Counsellors 129

D Films Reported To Be Used By Teachers 134

E Filmstrips Reported To Be Used By Teachers 136

THE STATUS OF SEX EDUCATION PROGRAMS
IN THE SCHOOLS OF
THE YORK COUNTY BOARD OF EDUCATION

I. INTRODUCTION

Origin and Nature of the Study

As the result of a Board motion passed June 13, 1977, a Sex Education Subcommittee of the Standing Commitee on Program was formed and staff were directed to collect information on the status of sex education programming in the Board's elementary and secondary schools. A report on the guidelines, curriculum and reference materials used by teachers was specifically requested but the study which evolved did not limit itself to only these concerns.

During the late summer two surveys were constructed, one to be administered to a sample of teachers, the other to principals. Whenever it was possible to do so without compromising the basic intent, the surveys were designed to facilitate comparison with the findings in the York Region with those found nationally in 1975 (as reported by Donal Deiseach in Family Life Education in Canadian Schools, Toronto: The Canadian Education Association, 1977).

The two instruments were drafted with the help of teachers, department heads, and Master Teachers representing the relevant subject areas. The drafts were reviewed by teachers, principals, other administrators, and trustees. The final draft instruments were tried out with a small number of teachers, vice-principals, and principals and, with the further small revisions were reviewed once more by administrators and the chairman of the subcommittee.

---

* See "On Comparisons with the CEA Study", page 45.

In the latter half of October 1977 a sample of teachers and principals was asked to respond anonymously to a survey delivered to each in person. It was explained to each recipient that the information would be used to study current sex education (SE) programming with an eye to determining whether or how students might be better served.

Teacher respondents were asked questions about their "planning approach" to SE programming, topics covered, time spent on SE, their formal training for SE, how comfortable they felt with whatever SE programming they did, which policies or guidelines they used in planning, about human and material resources they had used in the past, how parents were informed of SE programs, and how students and parents have reacted to sex education.

Both principals and teachers were asked their opinions on statements which reflect positions on the philosophy, scope, methodology, and outcomes of sex education. Principals were also asked about sex education's scope and participation rates in their schools. The survey forms provided respondents with space in which they could record their own experience and make observations or recommendations.

The covering letter to the survey attempted to relate sex education programming to the school subjects within which SE was believed to occur most commonly, for example, Physical and Health Education and Home Economics. The survey also concerned itself with human relations topics which, from previous studies, were known to be frequently related to SE. Examples of such topics in the early elementary grades include: sibling relations; parent - child relations; and being accepted by significant others. In more senior grades related topics include: values and lifestyles; different kinds of families; and legal aspects of marriage.

Also included were topics not directly related to sex education, but which have previously been found to be significant parts of programs in, for example, Health and Home Economics courses, or in the general socialization efforts across a wide range of grades. The frequency with which topics such as alcohol and drug use, family economics, the physically handicapped, and community health and social services are taught can serve as baselines against which one can compare the frequency with which SE topics are included in teachers' programs.

Replicas of the surveys appear as Appendix A and Appendix B to this report.

The Samples Used in the Survey and an Elaboration of the Study's Nature

Principal Sample - Secondary

It was determined that all 15 secondary school principals and 50 per cent of the principals of the 73 elementary schools (including schools for the trainable retarded) were to be polled.

- Elementary

Actually, 40 elementary schools were drawn and their principals asked to participate. Ninety-eight per cent, 39 principals, completed and returned the survey form. This 39 represents 53 per cent of all elementary principals.

There were 14 returns from the 15 secondary school principals (93 per cent).

Teacher Sample - Secondary

On the basis of earlier studies by Herold and others in Ontario, it was believed that, in secondary schools, most of the planned (as distinct from incidental) sex education was carried out in the Physical and Health Education programs, that considerable family life and related sex education was built into the Home Economics and Family Life courses, and that the Guidance Counsellors provided individual sex and family life education on an as-needed basis for students who requested counselling. No one questioned that some subject matter areas also regularly or occasionally covered sex education for their own perspectives, for example, heredity and genetics in botany and zoology. And no doubt sex education occurs incidentally in the social and behavioural sciences offerings such as Man in Society.

But it was decided to survey the secondary school teachers whose subjects most likely dealt directly with sex education. It was felt that full-time teachers whose timetables consisted solely of duties in Physical and Health Education, Family Studies, Home Economics, and Guidance singly or jointly, would most likely offer planned and purposeful SE programming or counselling. These same teachers, it was felt, would very likely be among those best trained in sex education and whose opinions might be best informed by experience in teaching or otherwise dealing with the relevant topics. A study of school rosters as of September 30, 1977, showed there were 104 such secondary teachers, more than 10 per cent of the secondary teacher force, and it was decided to limit the survey to this number.

As it happened, three full-time guidance counsellors declined to participate on the grounds that they did no work in sex education. Of the 101 responses, two were "not usable". One wrote "I am not engaged in an SE programme" and erased the answers given which appeared to indicate that something (SE counselling?) was, in fact, done. The other secondary teacher wrote that "When I was teaching SE I was employed in a Sr. Public School" and provided responses as to work done several years earlier. It was decided to exclude this rather different response set from the tally.

- Elementary

The elementary survey, on the other hand, was concerned with discovering what the "typically average" teacher, drawn by lot, was doing, had done, planned to do, or thought best to do. By random means, 112 names were drawn from the teacher rolls as at September 30, 1977. This represented about a 10 per cent sample of all full-time elementary teachers. These teachers, as it turned out after the draw, were located at 59 of the board's 73 elementary schools. Excluded from the draw were teachers whose special assignments or responsibilities made them atypical teachers, for example, itinerant remedial or diagnostic teachers, and itinerant French language teachers. But some atypical teachers who might have responsibilities that would or could cause them to be involved in teaching in the family life/sex education area were not excluded from the draw, e.g., developmental guidance teachers. Teachers of Special Education classes were eligible for the draw and a small number were drawn.

It was expected that first year teachers might be drawn and might wish to be excluded, that some teachers might be ill or unwilling to participate. However, there was only one teacher in hospital and only one teacher declined to accept the survey. Thus 110 of 112 surveys were completed and returned. One was not usable as the teacher made no responses. In addition, about half-a-dozen surveys were substantially incomplete, the respondents indicating that since they were "new" (either to the profession or to their present posting), they had nothing to offer concerning many items. What was offered was used and NA (Not Applicable) or NR (No Response) indicated wherever appropriate.

The high return rates and low rate of "not usable" are attributed to the method of distributing and collecting the survey forms. The extra effort to explain orally and in writing how this study might help build better programs for students seems well worth the effort. The sample size and return rates make it possible to generalize findings to the appropriate populations.

Some respondents provided extended explanations of matters they thought significant. A few were critical of some questions which they judged would not get the best answers available. All these indications of concern strongly suggest that the survey data as a whole will have a high degree of realiability and validity, notwithstanding the possible "vagueness" or "ambiguity" which was sometimes seen to exist unnecessarily in a few items.

A Limitation of the Survey Method

What is "sex education" and what is meant by "sex education programming"? This double-barrelled question reminds us that we must define our terms if communication is to be effective. It is especially important to take pains to indicate as best one can what one means in a survey such as used in the present study. This is because the respondent is unable to ask the researcher for clarification of what the respondent finds to be vague or ambiguous expressions, questions, or directions.

In sex education the task of defining terms is especially difficult for several reasons. Perhaps the common element of difficulty is that most teachers and principals grew up in an age when public discussion of sex education was largely non-existent. Sex education was something for which parents and clergy, medical professionals, and teachers played minor, supportive roles. Informal sex education went on at school, of course, and anywhere else where youthful curiosities could be satisfied. While some teachers no doubt have always responded to the whole range of developmental needs of children, clearly some teachers have not given sex education in their classrooms any attention. They have developed neither the concepts nor the vocabulary of "SE". In this respect, they have been supported by the Ministry of Education and their own school boards. "Sex Education", said a Ministry spokesman on a television panel show recently "is an emotive term". Since it evokes strong feelings that frustrate any attempt to deal with it rationally, "sex education" is stricken from the professional vocabulary. SE is tucked away into subject areas which are more socially acceptable, such as health or family life education.

In the absence of open professional discussion, definition of terms has been left to the school subject teachers to deal with in the light of their own disciplines and the relevant Ministry guidelines.

In preparing the survey instruments with teachers and principals, it became clear that to some "sex education" meant not much more than physiology and function ("the plumbing" as it is commonly called). For some others "sex education" was one aspect of "family life education". Even a more comprehensive view was held by a few who understood "sex education" to be a facet of a "social education" program concerned with the totality of human interrelationships. These different views seemed to reflect the differences in the subject matter studied as university students or dealt with later as teachers or counsellors. Home Economics majors (or teachers) tend to see sex education differently from Physical and Health Education majors, for example. And both views tend to differ from either the guidance counsellors' or the elementary school "generalist" teachers' concept of what is subsumed under the titles "sex education program".

"Defining terms" was attempted by developing a statement which was included in the letter to the sample of teachers and principals soliciting their participation. The relevant section read:

> ### Definition and Clarification
>
> In Ontario, "Sex Education" is not a subject, but it is provided for within various Ministry curriculum policies and subject guidelines which span all the divisions from Primary to Senior.
>
> Sex Education (SE) may be an integral part of school subjects such as Health, Family Studies, Developmental Guidance, Man and Society, Home Economics, and many humanities, social studies, and natural sciences courses. SE may be taught incidentally anywhere in the school but, for the purposes of this survey, such activities are not defined as a SE program.
>
> SE programs, especially in locally-designed elementary school curricula, are often given titles such as: Family Life Education; Social and Personal Development; Perspectives for Living; Christian Family Life; Social (or Moral or Ethical) Growth; Sociology and the Family. Such curricula may cover much more than sex education, for instance: learning to relate to siblings, parents, peers, and significant others; youth and the law; the structure, functions, and problems of families; mental health. This survey is concerned with SE in the context of such commonly related topics.

Less easy to deal with were terms used in the body of the survey. In asking respondents about the topics their programs dealt with, for example, one wonders how many possible interpretations are possible for the topics "Community Standards of Behaviour". Does it really matter if teachers' notions of what precisely is meant differ? Often the answer may be "No". In other cases different perceptions are not only likely, but the understandings (and hence answers) may be different enough to cause real concern for the validity of responses. For example, respondents were asked how strongly they agreed or disagreed with the statement "As a result of SE programming, students show more liberal attitudes on sex". How was "liberal attitudes" understood? ... as meaning free from uncritically examined bias? ... or as meaning free from moral restraint? or ...?

Attempts to rewrite items that were open to easy misunderstandings were not always successful. Versions which ran on and on, busily clarifying, were rejected as likely to "turn off" respondents, especially if they met such clarifications frequently. Compromises between clarity and length were made in order to keep the teacher survey to 10 pages. The assumption that a longer document would not be readily received by teachers is based on experience. Intuition suggests that too many arbitrary definitions might also turn teachers off.

An inherent weakness of the survey study compared to, for example, interview methods which feature two-way communication, is that one is not sure that communication to (or from) the respondent has been effective. This must be taken into account in interpreting responses to items in the present study. Traditionally, the inexpensive, quick, easy-to-administer survey is a prelude to more costly, time-consuming, more technically sophisticated methods of data collection. The survey serves best when used to get a good, general "fix" on the field under study and to determine where more intensive research is in order.

II. FINDINGS OF THE SURVEY OF ELEMENTARY TEACHERS

Guidelines and Policies Followed by Teachers

Three Ministry of Education curriculum guidelines as well as their policy statement The Formative Years (TFY) give at least some direction to the SE programming in York County public schools. The majority of elementary school teachers reported using one or two of the documents. These Ministry guides will be dealt with later. In addition, nine teachers reported using "locally developed curriculum guidelines". Three others made references to other guides.

Ten respondents indicated "no guidelines" or "not applicable" while another 19 did not answer this question. The majority of these 29 indicated that they offered only "incidental" or "hit-and-miss" sex education.

Of the teachers of grades kindergarten through five, 60 of 85 (71 per cent) indicated that their SE programming was based on The Formative Years (Circular P1J1), the Ministry's 1975 policy statement for the Primary and Junior Division. Two other respondents now teaching in grades 6-8 also indicated that TFY was one guide to their programs.

As government policy, TFY requires that the child "will be given opportunities to ... acquire an understanding, at an appropriate developmental level, of such life processes as ... reproduction and of the basic structure of the human body as it relates to such processes" (page 24). In the same section (Health) of TFY it is also required that children be given opportunities to "develop appropriate understandings regarding sexuality". Provision is made for opportunities to appreciate the relationship between physical development and social attitudes and behaviour and to acquire understanding of "mood and behaviour modifiers".

TFY also directs (for example, in the sections on "Values" and "Decision-Making") that opportunities be made available for the development of interpersonal skills. Such skills are relevant to the personal and interpersonal understandings which are basic to Sex Education and Family Life Education, such as what it means to choose a personal value set and a "lifestyle". The survey attempted to determine the extent to which teachers were including these topics which TFY seems to demand in their programs.

Except for a Special Education teacher, none of the nine teachers who cited locally-devised curriculum guidelines taught in the K-5 grade range. One in the Primary Division did make an unclear allusion to a school physical education program that seemed to cover some SE and another indicated that "The Gospels" provided the guide or policy followed.

As to locally-developed guidelines, three teachers of grades 6-8 indicated that they followed the "Toronto Board Family Life Education course" and one teacher of a grade 2-4 Special Education class (including at least one student as old as 14 years) follows the Metropolitan Separate School Board's "Family Life and Sexuality" course guidelines. Two grade 6-8 teachers follow "Living", a guide developed by the Windsor Board. One follows Etobicoke materials, one the York County Board's statement of aims and objectives, and one reported that a school physical education program provided the guidelines.

Thirteen other teachers of grades 6-8 cited the Ministry's guidelines, Physical and Health Education. This 1973 document provides physical education goals similar to TFY with respect to study of the processes of life, the structure and function of the body, and attitudes and values that contribute to wholesome living (page 1). Physical development in adolescence and a recognition of "the varying interests of student related to sex differences" are to be heeded by teachers. Segregation by sex is recommended for "activity classes" (it is not specified that this segregation includes lessons or discussions on, for example, sexual development topics, although the study found this to be commonplace). This document also clearly specifies as the basic objectives of the health program helping the student to develop "(a) independence and a sense of responsibility, (b) an understanding of human sexuality, (c) a personal value system" (page 6). Program content in health in the Intermediate Division (which extends from grades 7 to 10) could include:

> heredity and genetics;
>
> human anatomy (structure and function of organs)
>
> human development (including sex differences,
> menstruation, pre-natal development, birth process);
>
> alcohol and drugs;
>
> valuing and values clarification;
>
> human families
>
> human sexuality (including dating, courting, engagement);
>
> sex role stereotyping;
>
> venereal disease;
>
> stress.

The survey sought to discover whether these topics were, in fact, dealt with in the Intermediate and Senior Divisions and also in the Primary or Junior Divisions. The Ministry guideline Physical and Health Education is addressed to the Intermediate Division, but it also suggests that most of the above-noted topics may be introduced or developed in a basic way with kindergarten, primary, and junior students. Only values clarification and alcohol education were not recommended in Physical and Health Education for introduction at the kindergarten level (page 8). But in the more recent Ministry program book, Education in the Primary and Junior Divisions, both alcohol education and values clarification are identified as topics for which K-6 students must acquire a basic understanding (pages 20, 99-102). From the survey results, as we shall see, one might conclude that many teachers of K-6 are unaware of the Ministry's position or possibly reject it.

Seven teachers in grades 6-8 and one in grade 3-5 reported using the Ministry's Intermediate Division guideline Family Studies in planning for sex/family life programming. Child and Family Development are major themes of this program guide as is Management of Family Resources. The study sought to learn how many teachers deal with these topics.

While even child development may not, by some, be seen as sex education, it seems clear from the resource materials noted in Family Studies that psychosexual development is inherent in developmental studies and that topics such as pregnancy, preparing for parenthood and child birth -- all explicitly mentioned in Family Studies -- are important aspects of sex education. Other topics which deal with "learning to get along with 'self and others" are essential social education and relevant to getting along with the opposite sex. In any event, data on the frequency with which topics like "family economics" are taught helps us to assess by comparison the data we have on the frequency with which conventional SE topics (e.g., menstruation) are taught.

One teacher of grades 6-8 reported using the Ministry's guideline Man in Society, normally an optional course in grades 11-12. This may be an error on the teacher's part. However, the Man in Society course does deal with the family as an institution, values, the bonds of society, juvenile crime, courtship, etc., in short, with topics which may logically interface with even narrow or conventional notions of what sex education is about.

The Respondents and Their Teaching Assignments

Of the 112 elementary teachers asked to participate, 110 completed the survey and 109 responses were usable in whole or part. What were their teaching assignments? For which grades were they reporting? Since the sample was randomly selected, a data analysis which answers such questions tell us much about the deployment of teachers. It is important to attend to this since the survey is about what teachers do and think. We need to know with whom the teachers are "doing". Some readers will be surprised about how teachers are assigned.

Of the 109 respondents, only 50 teach one grade level, 34 teach at two, 15 teach at three, and 10 have responsibilities for many grade levels. While this often means that a teacher has, for example, a grade 2-3 "split grade class", unusal combinations are sometimes found. In an extreme case, one respondent teaches two grades in the Primary Division and one grade in the Intermediate (grades 1, 3, and 8). Today the typical teacher may have students spanning several grades and a range of ages. These students may be "housed" in one "class" (e.g., a grade 2-3 "split" class) or in more than one class, all of them served by an itinerant specialist (e.g., a physical and health education teacher).

The actual distribution looks like this:

TABLE 1: The Grade Assignments of Respondents

Teachers' Assignments	Grade (or Grade Equivalent)										
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total Grades	Total Teachers
This grade only	5	4	5	8	6	8	10	3	1	50	50
This grade + one other	1	2	6	8	8	9	7	15	12	68	34
This grade + two others	1	2	4	4	3	5	10	8	8	45	15
This grade + three or more or multiple but unspecified	2	4	4	4	2	5	4	4	4	33	10
TOTALS	9	12	19	24	19	27	31	30	25	196	109

Thus 109 teachers had responsibilities at 196 grade placements. This needs to be appreciated for several reasons. First, it reminds us that the old rigid structure of "one teachers, one class, one grade" is no longer the rule. Senior Public Schools and open plan schools are not the only places where teachers meet students at several grades (or grade equivalents). This, of course, impacts on how they teach. In dealing with sex education where "age appropriateness" is a significant consideration, teachers with a range of ages may not as readily decide and control what to introduce and how deeply to go into a topic as can their colleagues with a more homogeneous age class.

Second, in handling responses in this survey, some grouping by grade is desirable, even essential. But then it is not easy known if, for instance, a teacher of grades 3-5 who indicates dealing with a "mature" topic (menstruation, perhaps) actually deals with it with all the youngsters or just grade 5 students. Yet to provide for a grade-by-grade format ignores the fact of multiage and multigrade classes and introduces other problems.

The resolution for this study was to follow the solution arrived at in the 1975 CEA national survey referred to earlier. That is, grade groupings were laid out (K-2, 3-5, 6-8, 9-10, 11-13) and teachers permitted to answer just once for all appropriate groupings. But they were not required to give a grade-by-grade accounting. To do otherwise would have meant considerably more work in responding to the survey for at least 59 of 109 elementary teachers and virtually all secondary respondents. The latter commonly teach or counsel at three or more grade levels.

Some findings are reported by grade groups and we can show the numbers associated with each group. The actual numbers of elementary teachers principally working in each group and the absolute numbers of teachers in each grouping are shown in Table 2.

TABLE 2: Teachers Associated With Each Grade Group

Grouping	Principally in Each Group	Absolute No. in Each Group
K-2	21	35
3-5	44	63
6-8	44	53
TOTALS	109	151

Note: To work out the percentage distribution for answers to several question sets in this survey, "overlaps" were first eliminated.

SE Programming in the Elementary School

Programming for elementary students housed in secondary schools (at Sutton D.H.S., Huron Heights S.S., Stouffville D.S.S.) is dealt with in the major section "Findings of the Survey of Secondary Teachers". Some grade 7 and 8 students also are bused to high schools for subjects like Home Economics. Since the secondary teachers sample was drawn on a different basis, no comparison of data on SE programming in the grade 6-8 grouping in elementary and secondary settings is justified. This present section relates only to programming in elementary schools. Data on SE programming for elementary students given in high schools is reported in the next major section of this report.

The Approach to Planning SE Programs

Elementary teachers were asked to indicate which short descriptor best describes their approaches to SE programming. The results are shown in Table 3.

TABLE 3: Planning Approaches, By Grade Groups

Approach	K - 2	3 - 5	6 - 8	Totals
A distinct program of instruction	0	1*	9	10
A planned program, but integrated into other subject or programs	1	3	14	18
Taught incidentally, as need arises, or at "teachable moment"	10	33	18	61
Basically "hit-and-miss"	6	5	2	13
Not applicable or No Response	4	2	1	7
Totals	21	44	44	109

* Special Education class with children up to age 14 years.

This item did not provide a "No planning" option as it is bad form to ask anyone to admit to failing to do what policy requires be done -- and some would no doubt see *TFY* as requiring planning of opportunities. "Hit-and-miss", "not applicable", and no response probably cover the "no planning" situation pretty well.

Topics Covered By Elementary Teachers

Respondents were asked to indicate which of a list of 43 topics they dealt with with their students and also to note which topics, if any, were taught to boys only or girls only. Respondents were provided with spaces to write in additional relevant topics. All but two respondents indicated one or more topics dealt with in classes or in counselling sessions.

Table 4 shows the percentage of respondents who deal with each topic. It should be noted that no inferences can be made about the depth to which any topic is pursued from these figures. It should also be remembered that these figures relate to what *these teachers* do. Their students may also be exposed to other teachers (e.g., in rotary operations, especially in the Intermediate Division, to Physical and Health Education instructors). And, of course, much sex education (and some miseducation?) occurs out of school.

The topics, as noted earlier, include some not commonly thought of as related directly to SE although their ties to family life studies or the development of interpersonal skills is fairly obvious. Some other topics (for example, "community services" and "mental health and stress") provide bases for comparison of the frequency with which SE topics are taught compared with other topics which also are designated for courses such as Health or Family Studies.

TABLE 4: Topics Taught, By Grade Group, As Percentages

Topic	Grade Groups		
	K-2	3-5	6-8
1. Conception and birth	35	20	44
2. Heredity and genetics	15	32	50
3. Human sexual organs	0	12	44
4. Puberty	0	12	52
5. Gender identity or sex roles	38	34	44
6. Dating and going steady	0	4	27
7. Being accepted by significant others	73	68	60
8. Sex outside of marriage	0	2	4
9. Venereal diseases	0	2	27
10. The unmarried mother	0	0	2
11. Parenthood and child care	19	14	17
12. Parent - child relations	58	60	48
13. Sibling relations	65	56	52
14. Menstruation	0	12	44
15. Masturbation	0	0	13
16. Human sexual response	0	2	8
17. Youth and the law	15	28	38
18. Child molestation	42	26	19
19. Pornography	0	0	4
20. Homosexuality	0	2	8
21. Alcohol and drug use	4	8	54
22. Leaving home, setting up home	0	0	6
23. Choosing a marriage partner	0	0	4
24. Preparation for the wedding	0	0	2

	Grade Groups		
Topic	K-2	3-5	6-8
25. Legal aspects of marriage	0	0	2
26. Family economics	6	10	17
27. Factors conducive to a happy marriage	8	2	4
28. Religion and the family	23	12	6
29. Marriage breakdown, counselling	0	2	4
30. Family planning concept	0	0	4
31. Birth control methods	0	2	19
32. Abortion	0	0	4
33. Values and lifestyles	46	40	48
34. Different kinds of families	58	48	27
35. Community standards of behaviour	31	58	42
36. Marriage as a social institution	4	2	6
37. The woman in society	12	16	21
38. The physically handicapped	31	26	19
39. Mental health and managing stress	12	12	28
40. Community services offering help in health and family problems	12	8	6
41. The young single adult	0	0	2
42. Theories of personality	4	4	19
43. Sex techniques	0	0	0
*44. "Prenatal dev't., childbirth" (cf. #1)	0	0	2
*45. "Emotional growth"	0	0	2
*46. "Families" (aspects other than #34)	8	2	0
*47. "Growing up: birth to age 6"	4	0	0

* Write-ins by respondents.

The order in which topics were presented to respondents resembles that in the 1975 CEA survey and is essentially random "blocks" of two or three somewhat related items.

It is not the purpose of this report to interpret or evaluate the findings about program content. However, a few observations may help those who undertake such activities.

Topics with relatively "high" percentages seem to be of two varieties. Many relate to social adjustment (for example, numbers 7, 12, 13) or prudential concern for physical safety (number 18, "child molestation" seems to centre on matters such as the Block Parent operation). In both types, a "tailing off" seems to be present as the children grow up.

The topics with relatively "medium" percentages relate to personal adjustment (for example, numbers 5 and 33) and remain more or less constant over the years.

Most other topics start in K-2 with very low bases (less than 15 per cent) and, according to some respondents, are introduced as the child is seen to be ready or needs to be made ready (for example, "Puberty" and "Alcohol and Drug Use") until by grades 6-8 a substantial percentage of teachers are dealing with the topic.

The claim that some very important topics are introduced too late or not at all may be borne out by the figures given. For instance, the menarche now occurs for most girls before they enter grade 9 (about age 13 years) but the majority of elementary teachers may not have dealt with menstruation. We cannot know, however, if such instruction has been carried out by, say, health teachers operating on rotary. In another case-in-point, a considerable per cent of young adolescents is sexually active before entering high school, but neither venereal disease nor the family planning concept nor birth control methods appear to be widely taught. On the other hand, the majority of teachers may have dealt with related topics such as "Values and lifestyles" or "Sex outside of marriage" or "Community standards of behaviour".

Some SE topics are taught separately to boys and girls. About 25 per cent of teachers favour this practice. In addition, it appears that some topics are more frequently taught to girls. In grades 6-8, for instance, it seems more likely that girls will be taught the following topics than boys: dating and going steady; venereal disease; parenthood and child care; parent - child relations; menstruation; birth control methods; the woman in society; and theories of personality.

Perhaps this is as it should be even if it constitutes sex bias in sex education. However, one can anticipate problems arising from this situation if, for example, girls assume that boys are more sexually sophisticated and hence leave to the boys the responsibility for birth control and prevention of V.D.

These observations, as noted, are not intended as the interpretations or the evaluations to be made, but as possible stepping-off points from which interested parties may, if they choose, begin to march through the data.

Time Given to Sex Education

A survey is not the best way to determine how subject matter is taught or how well it is taught. A survey can evoke certain information from which inferences can be made. A survey can seek data on "inputs" into the instructional processes -- how much time is given, how well trained the teachers are, what materials are used, which human resources are seconded to the teacher's aid, etc.

Let us first look at the time that teachers report they provide for sex education. It is not known how time (an input) relates to the learning (an output) wanted from a SE program. Interested parties will have to make their own assumptions. These might be:

> that some time is better than no time;
>
> that, after a certain point, the return on time invested diminishes, that, for example, 100 minutes of instruction per week is not necessarily twice as productive as 50 minutes per week;
>
> that the manner in which time is "blocked out" affects learning (e.g., three minutes a day for 20 days a month does not necessarily have the same impact as a 20-minute session three times a month or one 60-minute session a month).

"Time distributions", rather than averages therefore seem to be called for when tabulating the data. A "time distribution" is actually just a grouping procedure and an average can be estimated by calculating the weighted means of the midpoints of each grouping, if anyone wishes to. Some respondents noted that the figure supplied was a "guesstimate" or average for several grades. Rounded figures (10, 20, 40, etc.) were common. All of this suggests that the grouped data approach should be taken.

TABLE 5: Time Given For SE, By Grade Grouping

Minutes Per Month	Grade Grouping K-2	Grade Grouping 3-5	Grade Grouping 6-8
0	1	5	2
1 to 15	5	5	4
16 to 30	2	8	9
31 to 45	2	5	3
46 to 60	4	2	2
60 or more	1	1	5
No response or "other"	20	37	28
Totals	35	63	53

"Other" responses consisted of statements such as "Hard to say", "Varies considerably", "Since it (SE) is largely incidental, I just can't recollect (time spent)". About a dozen such comments were written in but quite likely this is a very general situation. Quite possibly this is not a reasonable question to ask of teachers whose programs are "integrated" rather than atomized, as is often the case before rotary organization and subject specialization is encountered in the Intermediate Division.

It is clear, however, that for those who did estimate the time spent on SE, more than half give less than 31 minutes per month. This is understandable given that the common planning approach is "incidental" with many "hit-and-miss" approaches also reported.

It seems clear that only a baker's dozen amongst the respondents spends much class time (45 minutes or more per month) on SE. This is about half the number who reported planned or distinct programs of instruction (see Table 3).

Teacher Training in Sex Education

Another "input" factor is the competence of the teacher. Many variables are involved in making a teacher competent and formal training is not the least.

In response to the question

"Have you taken any formal training in SE?"

only 17 teachers answered "Yes". There was no response from 9 teachers and 83 checked "No".

Those claiming formal training were asked to provide details and 12 did so. It is not clear that these respondents gave full accounts but here is how these dozen obtained formal training in either the content or methods of sex education.

TABLE 6: Formal Training in Sex Education

Nature of Training	Number
(a) University undergrad course only	4
(b) (a) plus preservice training (faculty of education)	1
(c) (a) plus inservice training (school board)	2
(d) (b) plus graduate courses	1
(e) (a) plus Ministry of Education "certificate program"	2
(f) Dept. of Health (Toronto) one-day course	1
(g) Inservice training (Metro Sep. School Board)	1

The limited extent of training may reflect on a host of matters. Perhaps the most parsimonious explanation is that, in the past, teacher training institutions, school boards and teachers shared the then prevailing view that sex education was not the school's job. Some still hold strongly to the view that the school has no place in the bedrooms of the nation, of course, but that is not a position shared by journalists and public health workers, apparently.

One would want to look at the responses to another item in the survey in which respondents were asked how strongly they agreed or disagreed with the statement "There is a need for more teacher inservice SE training". Eighty agreed, seven disagreed. Many teachers obviously recognize a deficiency in their professional training.

One also needs to understand how some teachers feel about the gap between the job that the Ministry of Education and some of the public expect the schools to do and the training the teachers have for the task of sex education. The next page of the survey throws some light on this matter.

How "Comfortable" Are Teachers with their SE Programs?

The question "How comfortable do you feel about the SE program(s) you teach?" ran onto the shoals somewhat. It was intended that teachers who offered no programming (in this study it was stated that "incidental" teaching was not to be considered "programming") should not reply to this question. But this was not clearly enough understood with respect to this question. Sixteen who elsewhere indicated little or no SE programming did pass this item by. But a half-dozen or so others indicated that they were "Generally comfortable" or "Very comfortable" with having no program. When these were subtracted from those totals and added to "No response", this is how the question was answered.

TABLE 7: Degree of Comfort with SE Programming

Condition	Number
Very comfortable	31
Generally comfortable	47
Uncomfortable	2
Very uncomfortable	5
No response	24

Two respondents indicated that they were ill at ease with the inadequate job they were doing and expressed concern. One wrote, "Totally inadequate -- my conscience bothers me".

All others were uncomfortable because they thought that parents or others would not understand or approve or support what they were teaching. One teacher of grade 1 and grade 4 wrote, "This is a particularly worrying problem as parents have so many differing views on SE. Thus it would be difficult to teach SE without worrying or upsetting some parents". Other items (discussed later) indicates widespread apprehension about public support -- or rather lack of support -- for sex education in the schools.

Some felt comfortable despite very limited programs. One wrote that it is "OK if topics come from students but would be very uncomfortable if I had to impose the topics: I do not feel it is up to me". This too reflects teacher reluctance to accept the new responsibility which has devolved upon the school. Articulate rejections of this awesome burden were expressed and some are reproduced later in this report.

Resource Persons Used in SE Programs

Most teachers who plan SE programs use one or more resource persons. These may make up for teacher inadequacies and may make significant contributions to the SE process even though they are "one-shot" efforts, not a program. The resource persons and the audiovisual and other aids they bring may share the credit for whatever success SE programs attain. On the other hand, the teachers' evaluations of the resource persons suggest that some "outside experts" are very inadequate teachers. But first let us see which resource agents were reported to be used prior to the present year.

TABLE 8: Resource Persons Used

Title	No. of Teachers Using
School or Public Health nurse	31
Medical doctor	13
Social worker	7
Other teachers or counsellors	3
Minister, priest or rabbi	2
Police	2
Child care worker	1
Red Cross worker	1
School psychologist	1

The most frequently given reasons for using these persons was to "tap expertise" or to "take advantage of experience" or to "expose children to other viewpoints".

Occasionally such reasons were paired with observations that these persons helped children become aware of "community resources" or gave the students exposure to the helping professions in other than a client relationship.

Several teachers indicated that they believed that these persons (especially doctors and nurses) could not only speak as experts but had society's permission to speak on these matters. A few teachers indicated that they knew as much relevant information as was needed and could, in fact, convey it more fluently than "the experts". In fact, students are often turned off by experts who tell them more than they care to know. But teachers used these human resources for reasons other than their teaching skills as mentioned above or as follows.

Resource persons (counsellors, psychologist) were used for one-on-one diagnosis or treatment of students with special needs. Public Health Nurses were often used, it was reported, because the nurses took the initiative, inviting themselves into the classroom. They brought films, pamphlets or other materials which were judged useful and hence they were invited back. One respondent said a minister was invited "to check Biblical views of marriages and customs".

Teaching Aids Used

Teachers were asked to list texts and supplementary references used in their SE programming. They were also asked to identify other materials used.

Only a few books were named by elementary teachers. Respondents indicated that with what is required by way of introducing SE topics to young children, books would be inappropriate as well as unnecessary. PHE teachers at the grade 7 and 8 level were using a text (Understanding Health) and a few teachers named one or two references for themselves and the students (the Bible was listed, for instance).

A list of books reported to be used by elementary or secondary teachers appears as Appendix C. Sixteen of the 97 titles are from elementary teachers.

Respondents also reported using some soundfilms or videotapes, but could not always recall exact titles. An attempt was made to trace titles and to determine whether they were available from the Board's film library. Titles which could be confirmed are listed in Appendix D. Fourteen elementary respondents named a total of nine films, six of which were identifiable. Of all 40 films named by elementary and secondary teachers, 24 (60 per cent) are available from the Education Resource Centre Film Library. However, it appears that there are many more SE and FLE films in the ERCFL that are used in York County schools than were reported by the respondent sample. Possibly these were used by other teachers.

Filmstrips are used in the Intermediate Division (grades 7-10) principally by health teachers. Some use is reported in the Senior Division and only rarely before grade 6. Filmstrips named by teachers appear in Appendix E.

A small percentage of elementary respondents also reported using wall-charts and (overhead) projectual materials to illustrate anatomy, magazine articles, multimedia kits ("Developing Understanding of Self and Others" life cycle kits that explain V.D., menstruation or birth control), radio broadcasts, audiotapes, records, and newspapers. Less than 15 per cent of respondents reported using any such aids and only a handful reported using more than three aids other than films. Only one teacher reported asking students to watch television perhaps because the better programs (for example, The Human Journey series) are aimed at older persons.

Teachers and Parents

Respondents were asked two questions:

(1) "Please describe briefly how parents are informed of the SE program(s) you teach."

(2) "Briefly, what kinds of reactions to your SE program are you getting from students, parents."

What was reported supports other indications that many teachers do not think their SE programs would be supported by parents. On the other hand, the data suggests that those who have had dialogue with parents find them (with some exceptions) appreciative of what SE programming is offered.

In answer to the first part, teachers of K-5 students indicated that, in the main, nothing is done to inform parents except when they raise questions or perhaps incidentally (for example, if on a classroom visit a parent notices SE materials). Four K-5 teachers send "completed assignments" or "students' notes" home with the children to let parents see what is being done. Two report inviting parents to come to school to see and discuss SE films to be shown to students. Another two send parents a letter which permits them to exclude their children from SE lessons. Three others indicated ways in which parents might be informed but it is not clear that these methods were actually used. Several pointed out that their classroom door is always open to visitors.

The incidental nature of SE programs perhaps accounts for the fact that not much is communicated to the homes by K-5 teachers. Perhaps, since many of these "non-reporters" later strongly agreed with the statement that "The SE program is misunderstood by parents and lacks support" there is another explanation.

The nine K-5 teachers who reported feedback from parents contradict these who see parents as neither understanding nor acceptant. All respondents said that parents were "in favour", "pleased", "grateful", "cooperative", "positive" or words to that effect. One reported "understanding" from "parents who have initiated sex education at home". Thirteen teachers said that they had received no response from the parents with respect to their SE programming.

Some teachers of 6-8 take the initiative, informing parents about their SE programming: five send letters or notes home describing activities (one provides for interviews also) and three others inform parents of "special" SE programming. One other asks for parental consent before students see films. A number suggest that parents learn from their children what is going on. Five arrange displays of the PHE program (including SE) on their bulletin boards at times such as Open House or Parents' Night. Several indicate, in the words of one, that a "complete and detailed copy of whole health program available on request". Another wrote that the principal will be contacted "to see what methods he prefers" for informing parents. One said flatly that no informing is done.

The 6-8 teachers also found parents acceptant of the SE programming, or even "enthusiastic". One teacher reported "some negative" feedback, another got "mixed" reactions and a third found "some concern about parts of the program". One teacher said parents thought the schools should "teach sooner" while another found a parent who said SE should be taught at home. One said parents were "nonchalant". But the large majority of respondents saw parents as appreciative of what the teacher was trying to do.

When asked what kinds of reactions their SE programs were getting from students, one elementary teacher (of K-2) said that students were "sometimes self-conscious" and a K-8 teacher wrote that some were "shy initially". One K-8 teacher found "mixed reaction" and another teacher at this level found "some immature responses". Three teachers thought the students "acceptant" and one grade 3-5 teacher said this was "because it is not thrust upon them". Twenty-eight respondents found the students interested, positive, enthusiastic, responsive and eager to learn, mature and of a questioning nature, or words to the same effect. Except for one teacher who saw "nothing reportable", the other 50 per cent or so did not respond to this item, at least directly. The bulk of these did not offer any substantial SE programming. This does not mean they have no opinion on this or other items.

In fact, these teachers who do not offer much (or any) sex education wrote, often in length, in the space provided at the end of the survey, about their own reactions as parents as well as teachers. Here is what some said (with very minor editing).

> As a parent I feel that most sex education programming should stem from the home. (a K-2 teacher)
>
> More contact between home and school is needed to decide how thorough programs should be.
> (a K-2 teacher)
>
> Sex education is the parents' responsibility.
> (a grade 3-5 teacher)
>
> Sex education should be done with the parents in attendance. (a grade 3-5 teacher)

> Let's not get a SE bandwagon going...many teenagers are not ready for wholesale sex instruction....the joys of sex need not be pushed at the kids. When they are ready and curious they will ask. (a grade 6-8 teacher)

> I resented having my daughter shown all the items of contraception at High School when our church and home stand is strongly against premarital sex. I feel this sort of education would be an imposition of generally accepted standards upon every student and would be in direct conflict to some values strongly heed by a considerable percentage of the population.
> (a grade 3-5 teacher)

> SE is best on a one-to-one basis. (a grade 6-8 teacher)

> SE is a topic of a highly personal nature and consequently should be handled by a loving and caring parent who knows his child. Thus SE can be taught at the right time in the right way. A teacher trying to deal with it in a class situation may never know...his children so well that he can deal with SE in a class situation. In addition, if he tries, he may be faced with the problem that what is being discussed may be relevant to only one or two out of a class of thirty. (a grade 6 teacher)

In another part of the survey (reported on the next pages of this report), respondents were asked again about the degree of parental support and understanding (as mentioned earlier). Respondents were also asked if they agreed with the statement "Students are very receptive and sensible about SE". While 26 elementary teachers neither agreed nor disagreed, 9 tended to disagree but none disagreed strongly. On the other hand, 51 tended to agree with this assertion and 15 strongly agreed with the judgment that children responded well.

This suggests that the fears of sex education expressed by some teachers are rooted elsewhere than in a belief that students are not sensible. A few expressed the concern (or perhaps the belief) that teaching about sex leads to a desire to experiment with sex. However, research in the U.S.A. suggests the opposite, that lack of wanted knowledge leads to "experimentation" beginning with "playing doctor" and proceeding until information needs are satisfied. Would anyone seriously entertain the assumption that if young girls are kept ignorant, they will not get pregnant? Or that if one is ignorant of VD, one will not contract syphillis? Another frequently suggested opinion is that since sex education is "best taught in the home" (an assumption widely held) it is, in fact, taught in the home. U.S. studies show that about 90 per cent of parents think SE should be taught primarily in the home, but only about 40 per cent make the effort, then mainly for girls.

If one censors children's reading and televiewing materials, isolates them from other children, takes the batteries from their transistor radios, forbids attendance at church and movies, and prohibits sex education at school, it is possible to restrict sex education to the home. Otherwise it may be only a question of whether the child will be educated or miseducated randomly from "life" or systematically (one hopes) in school.

Teachers' Views on Scope, Organization, Needs, and Outcomes of SE

To collect teachers' opinions on a variety of matters relevant to SE, they were presented with 15 statements and asked to indicate how strongly they agreed or disagreed with the positions represented by each assertion.

Some statements dealt with the scope and focus of SE (#1, 5, 7, 10), others with the manner of organization and presentation (#4, 6, 9, 11), others with teacher needs (#2, 3, and 9 again), others with [illegible] of parents and students (#8, 12) as a means of cross-checking earlier questions on these matters, and other statements dealt with SE program "outcomes" as best the respondents could judge (#13, 14, 15).

The teachers' reactions are recorded in Table 9, below. Responses were tallied separately for teachers primarily assigned to K-2, grades 3-5, and grades 6-8. The response patterns of the first two groups were very similar, so they have been "collapsed" into one grouping. Such significant differences as there were between K-2 and 3-5 teachers will be noted after the table. The views of teachers of grades 6-8 often differed substantially from their colleagues, as the table shows.

TABLE 9: Teachers' Views on Selected Aspects of SE, As Percentage

(Teachers of K-5 in upper left, teachers of 6-8 in lower right)

Key: SA/SD = Strongly Agree/Disagree N = Neither Agree Nor Disagree
TA/TD Tend to Agree/Disagree NR = No Response

	Statements	SA	TA	N	TD	SD	NR
1.	SE is a necessary subject for students at all grades	24 34	37 23	16 18	10 16	5 5	8 5
2.	There is a need for more teacher in-service SE training	35 50	35 32	16 9	3 0	3 7	8 2
3.	There is a need for more SE instructional materials	35 55	38 20	19 16	0 2	2 2	6 5
4.	SE should be interdisciplinary and should be integrated with other programs	35 27	44 36	13 16	3 7	3 9	2 5
5.	The main focus in SE should be on living rather than sex	49 57	40 23	8 11	2 2	0 0	2 0
6.	SE should not be a school subject; it should be handled by sex counselling and incidental teaching	13 14	22 14	19 11	24 36	16 23	6 2
7.	Give SE as early as possible	25 23	40 16	19 36	19 16	2 7	5 2
8	The SE program is misunderstood by parents and lacks support	21 16	24 32	35 32	10 9	3 9	8 2

(continued)

Statements	SA	TA	N	TD	SD	NR
9. There is a need for smaller classes for SE discussion	17 27	33 32	32 23	2 11	3 3	13 2
10. Morals, religion should be emphasized in SE	16 11	16 20	25 23	24 23	13 18	6 5
11. SE should be given to boys and girls together	11 21	41 27	19 25	17 18	5 9	6 0
12. Students are very receptive and sensible about SE	11 18	52 41	19 32	10 7	0 0	8 1
13. SE programming significantly increases students' knowledge	16 23	32 41	33 30	5 2	3 0	11 5
14. As a result of SE programming, students show more liberal attitudes on sex	5 0	13 2	48 61	21 14	5 18	10 5
15. Students' behaviours are more responsible as a result of SE programming	5 14	24 32	49 50	10 2	0 0	13 2

Looking at the statements which deal with scope and focus (#1, 5, 7, 10), some tentative conclusions can be drawn.

By a three-to-one ratio, teachers agreed that sex education "is a necessary subject for students at all grades". Only 15 per cent of teachers of younger children disagreed with this view.

There was virtually no disagreement with the view that "The main focus in SE should be on living rather than sex". The definition of "living" may need to be considered, but several respondents (usually PHE teachers) at the Intermediate and Senior Divisions noted that their teaching objectives for SE were aimed at enhancing the quality of life through promoting a better understanding of one's sexuality (or "the sexual nature of the human being").

Item 7 was intended to complement item #1. Very much the same persons disagreed with "Give SE as early as possible" as rejected SE at all grades. A number who agreed with statement #1 moved to the "neither agree nor disagree" for #7. One of these wrote, "If 'as early as possible' means not starting in the primary grades, I disagree". A kindergarten teacher wrote that SE "in early life makes it easier to accept one's sexuality in later life".

As to the question of focus for a SE program, the statement (#10) that "Morals, religion should be emphasized in SE" brought very many write-ins. Teachers of K-2 were more inclined to agree than their colleagues. Four teachers of grades 3 through 8 crossed out "religion" in giving their responses in order to support a moral basis and reject a religious basis for SE. Write-ins often ran something like this from a teacher of grades 4-6.

> I sympathize with parents who fear their child may be led down the garden path by either Bible-pounding "Christians" or atheists, existentialists, etc. However, I realize that the teacher's moral and religious views are bound to affect the type of materials covered in the program.

A teacher of grades 4 and 5 wrote:

> I am strongly opposed to presenting the clinical side of sex education without also establishing that there is a moral side as well. I feel most students by grade seven at least know the basic operations and techniques, but how many are aware of the (other) aspects....?

Several teachers suggested that a values-neutral stance by the school could not clarify for children the issues which revolve about sexual behaviour "or satisfy the public" which wants a values component embedded in social education.

Several teachers stated explicitly that the church shared responsibility (with the parents) for sex education. None suggested that the church had failed young people in this respect. (For that matter, no one said that the family or public health officials had failed, either.)

In matters of organization and presentation, views on the desirability of integrating sex education with other subject matter (item #4) varied inversely with grade. Generally, the lower the grade the greater the agreement with the proposition. Still, the great majority favoured interdisciplinary and integrated approaches rather, presumably, than making SE an independent subject.

But this did not mean that the majority of teachers thought SE should be left to "counselling" or "incidental teaching" (item #6). Generally, one-in-three teachers K-5 would be happy were it so, but about 40 per cent would not. Teachers of more senior grades were two-to-one in disagreement with the statement.

More than half the respondents saw "a need for smaller classes for SE discussion" and only about five per cent disagreed with statement #9. Most of the N and NR's came from teachers who offered little or no sex education.

Whether "SE should be given to boys and girls together" (statement #11) boiled down to "depends on age" or "depends on topic" according to many write-ins. Perhaps "age" and "topic" are closely related. This statement was agreed to by half the respondents but a quarter were "on the fence" (N or NR).

Teachers' views on responses of parents and students to SE (statements #8, 12) can be checked against the earlier question calling for essentially similar information. Assessment of parents understanding and support (#8) did not vary much from grade to grade nor was there much variation with respect to students' responses. Only two K-2 teachers disagreed with statement #8 and teachers of grades 3-5 were much stronger (SA) in their support of statement #12: otherwise response patterns were comparable.

In dealing with statements that reflect upon teachers' perceptions of their own needs (#2, 3, 9), one statement (#9) has already been dealt with under organization. Only three K-2 teachers and seven grade 6-8 teachers felt smaller groupings were not needed.

Given their lack of SE training, it is scarcely to be wondered that three in four respondents expressed agreement with statement #2, "There is a need for more in-service SE training". In fact, "more" makes one ask what, if anything, has been offered in the past.

About three in four respondents saw "a need for more SE instructional materials" (statement #3). This is harder to comprehend inasmuch as there is a wealth of available books, films, kits, etc., as described by the teachers themselves. From comments elsewhere, it may be program outlines in booklet form that some of these respondents had in mind. It is clear that many teachers, especially in K-5, do not think that texts would be useful. This is an area where clarification of needs seems in order. It may be that teachers are unaware of the variety and quantity of program guides and teaching aids available to them.

The Outcomes of Sex Education

There are a limited number of Canadian studies on the effectiveness of school SE programs. This is partly due to the relative novelty of SE as a visible part of the curriculum, partly a reflection of the difficulty in getting substantial evidence about "outcomes" (as distinct from the "inputs" and "processes" of SE), and certainly in large measure due to the difficulty in even determining what "effectiveness" means when related to SE. The goals of SE are fuzzy, if they are stated at all, and makes goal-referenced evaluation difficult if not impossible.

While preparing this survey, a review of possible definitions of "effectiveness" was undertaken. Apparently the effectiveness of SE programs can be viewed from at least seven different but not mutally exclusive perspectives. Effectiveness can be judged upon:

(1) testimonial evidence from students/parents/teachers or others as to whether a program is "effective" (leaving respondents to decide whether this means interesting/informative/attitude- or value-shaping/or other criteria of adequacy);

(2) objective tests of relevant knowledge (for example, of human physiology and development, contraception, venereal disease);

(3) tests (perhaps subjective) of subsequent attitude changes (for example, a greater sense of responsibility, a greater ethical bias, more powerful moral reasoning method);

(4) evidence of subsequent appropriate behaviours (some may be more readily observable than others -- how easy is it to observe abstinence or proper birth control methodologies?);

(5) evidence of subsequent outcomes (unfortunately, there is more interest in and concern for unwanted outcomes such as pregnancy and VD than there is for happy and wholesome sexual maturity and intimacy);

(6) evidence of further interest or involvement in sex education;

(7) evidence of a widening sphere of interest in "related" matters of human sexuality (for example, concern for sex role stereotyping or sex discrimination in employment).

This may not exhaust the list, but it illustrates the fact that concern for "outcomes" or "effectiveness" has many dimensions.

It was arbitrarily decided to ask teachers' views (evaluations) with respect to three general dimensions, (1) knowledge, (2) attitudes, and (3) behaviours.

Statements #13, 14, and 15 are consequently at some level of generality or fuzziness. The inherent ambiguity of #14 was noted in the Introduction to this report.

As a general observation about the responses to these three items, it must be noted that most respondents could not or would not render a judgment with respect to statements 14 and 15 and about 40 per cent "passed" on #13.

Whatever this says about evaluation of outcomes, the fact that there were so many N and NR cases raises certain questions. For instance, is it lack of evidence or unwillingness to judge or both that accounts for this pattern?

In any event, those who did jump off the fence landed squarely on the "agree" side of the statement "SE programming significantly increases students' knowledge". Teachers of grades 6-8 were much surer of this.

Over 60 per cent "passed" on #14 ("...students show more liberal attitudes..."), but of the others the majority tended to disagree. These respondents, however, included a fair number who offered little or no SE programming. Almost as many K-5 teachers agreed with this statement as disagreed (11 vs 16 teachers). Only one teacher of grade 6-8 agreed with the statement.

A number of respondents wrote that they had no way of knowing whether "Students' behaviours are more responsible as a result of SE programming". Sixty-two per cent of K-5 were N or NR but 75 per cent of the others agreed. As might be expected with teachers of older students, there was somewhat less uncertainty (52 per cent). Moreover, all but one of 21 teachers of grades 6-8 thought behaviours more responsible after SE.

For Further Thought

Some 31 additional observations on SE programming were provided by elementary school teachers in the space provided at the end of the survey. Many of these overlapped and most of the major points have now been reported.

Two areas which received attention from these thoughtful teachers have been held to conclude this part of the report and both deal with program needs.

The first area deals with guidelines and policy needs, the second with program organization. They were often joined as in the following judgment by a teacher of grades 3-5: "It is important to have specific guidelines and a progressive program that can be carried on continuously through the grades". A variation on this common theme was put by another teacher also working in this grade range: SE "is a valuable subject; however a more consistent approach throughout the county is needed ... poll parents ... for different viewpoints".

This view is not every teacher's idea of how to get on with SE. A grade 5 teacher wrote "Ignorant parents become violent" but the Ministry and boards must stand up to them. "Tell them what their children are going to be taught regarding SE (and) that they are not to dictate to educators content of such curriculum".

Teachers may not be aware that the Ministry issues general guidelines and leaves it to boards to nail down specific goals. In any case, respondents wrote (in the words of a grade 6-8 teacher) that "The Ministry should be more definite in guidelines ... show more direction".

So it goes: one says the board should lead, another wants parents to have a say, yet another looks to the Ministry. Many also say "I think what we should be looking for in SE for York County is consistency in program" (from a grade 6-8 teacher).

It seems to the present writer that in order to arrive at any consistent, worthwhile and widely acceptable program there must be one other source of input -- the children themselves and their needs as they express them. No matter how incomplete and inarticulate such expressions may be, children's questions are a logical starting point not just for "incidental" SE, but for a comprehensive planned program.

Hindsight indicates that teachers might well have been asked by the survey "What do your students ask about? What are their adjustment needs? What real life problems have evoked the best ad hoc SE lessons? etc.

Fortunately, research has been done elsewhere* on the questions young people ask parents or, in the case of older children who tend not to ask their parents, questions asked of doctors, teachers and counsellors. Readers of newspapers (like the Toronto Star) and magazines which offer "expert" answers to readers' questions will be familiar with the topics which perplex teenagers and older persons.

"Among the questions most asked by preschoolers," say Gordon and Dickman in Sex education: the parents' role (Public Affairs Committee, Inc., New York, 1977) are:

- Will I have breasts (or a penis) like yours?
- How did I get into mommy's stomach?
- Why do you have a penis (or breasts) and I don't?
- What does the word "fuck" mean?
- What is a tampon for?
- Does intercourse hurt?
- Where do babies come from?
- How do babies get out of their mommy's tummy?
- Does it hurt to have a baby?

---

* For example, by Sol Gordon, Professor of Child and Family Studies and Director of the Institute for Family Research and Education at Syracuse University's College for Human Development.

They report that the questions asked by preteens include the following:

- How does a baby stay alive inside the mother?
- What does "have sexual intercourse" mean?
- What happens when girls menstruate?
- What is a wet dream?
- Why do kids say "dirty" words?
- Do boys have periods?
- Do girls have wet dreams?
- When will I develop like my friends?
- What are men's balls for?
- Why are some children adopted?
- What's a rubber (condom) for?

Whether these are the exact questions youngsters in the York Region would ask is not the point. Rather, a valid set of questions for children at various ages could be compiled and studied along with other data relevant to assessing their needs. From thence a meaningful, continuous and consistent program might be built.

Teachers, preachers, parents and many others have valid input to make. But it is the children whose education is under consideration and they too must be looked at as a source of curriculum.

On Comparisons with the CEA Study

As indicated in the introduction to this report, the surveys were designed so that some comparisons could be made with the findings of a national study done in late 1975 by the Canadian Education Association.

The teacher population surveyed by the CEA was not a random sample of classroom teachers, as was the York County study. The CEA put their questions to "Family Life Education teachers" and this had to be interpreted by the school districts. How FLE teachers were defined is not known, but they cannot be considered a randomly-drawn, typically average group of classroom teachers.

Further, these FLE teachers were employed in only 676 of the 998 boards invited to participate in the CEA study. The respondent boards were self-selected, not random. In the opinion of the study's author, Dr. Donal Deiseach, the boards and hence the teachers responding were relatively more engaged in FLE than non-respondents. This caused an inflation in figures such as those reporting, for example, "the proportion of teachers covering FLE topics" (Table 11 in the CEA report Family Life Education in Canadian Schools).

Thus it is not proper to compare directly the percentage figures (for example, regarding the topics covered) in the two studies. The CEA found that 55 per cent of K-2 FLE teachers deal with conception and birth, for instance, but only 35 per cent of York County K-2 classroom teachers do. This does not tell us that, nationally, the topic is more likely to be covered than it is in York County. This may be true, but we cannot know since the populations polled are different.

What use then is there in comparing findings? There are several fairly easy and informal ways of making use of the two sets of data. Let us look at the "topics taught" data in order to illustrate.

First, one can merely determine, by inspection, which topics have "high", "medium", or "low" coverage relative to all the topics in each survey. Then make the comparisons. Next, look for discrepancies. What is "high" nationally but not locally? (Note: the "national" picture is heavily influenced by Ontario input: 77 per cent of teacher respondents in the CEA survey taught in Ontario boards.)

Similarly, one may rank-order the topics on the basis of percentages, then make comparisons and analyses.

Or one can select only those topics for which there is a special concern. The topics lists are not identical, but the overlap is about 75 per cent (some topics in the York County study were suggested by respondents to the CEA study: others came from recommendations by York County educators or Dr. Deiseach). Where the topics appear on both lists and substantial differences in coverage seem to exist (as determined from, say, rank-ordering) one can begin to ask whether local conditions are basically different from the "national" situation.

"Final answers" will not come from these sort of activities, of course. As stated before, the survey is a relatively parsimonious means of getting data which helps one decide what questions should next be pursued in depth by means such as interviews, public forums, in-class observations, calling for briefs, or even experimental methodologies that test out the tentative conclusions a survey helps one draw.

III. FINDINGS OF THE SURVEY OF ELEMENTARY PRINCIPALS

A survey of principals was done simultaneously with the poll of teachers (see Appendix B). Forty of the county's 73 elementary principals were randomly drawn to constitute the sample. It was expected that a few might be unable to take part due to absence or because of special assignments, but that a 50 per cent sample of the 73 would be quite satisfactory. In fact, 39 (of 40) responded. Better than half (53 per cent) of all elementary principals have provided data from which we may generalize to all County public schools.

The principals' survey differed substantially from the teachers' but was designed so that there could be some informal crosschecking or comparison of identical items. An explanation of the survey was given to principals (as also to teachers) defining and clarifying the concept of sex education (see page 8 of this report).

The Principals and Their Schools

Since these respondents were selected by chance, findings should be generalizable. However, it was decided to see whether the sample, judged by the grades enrolled in the schools, seemed representative of the population of YCBE public schools. TMR schools were treated separately. Otherwise, "grouping by grades" was done in order to avoid creating separate categories where only one or a few schools of a type exist (e.g., the few grade 1-8 or 1-6 schools).

As the results show (Table 10), there was very little difference between the sample and the population with respect to the grades taught therein. The "junior" elementary schools (C and D in Table 10) are slightly over-represented and the "senior" public schools are correspondingly under-represented. How this might bias results can only be guessed. Possibly the principals' views will be flavoured if their opinions are only rooted in the ages of students in their own schools.

It is perhaps worth noting that just more than half of the respondents administer schools with grades seven or eight students.

TABLE 10: Comparison of Samples and Population of Schools

	School Organization by Grades	% of Sample	% of Population
A.	K-8, K-7, 1-8	38	42
B.	5-8, 6-8, 7-8	13	14
C.	K-6, 1-6	31	29
D.	K-5, K-4, 1-5	13	11
	TMR	5	4
	Total	100	100

In conclusion, it should be repeated that findings from the sample ought to be reliable indicators for the whole population of elementary principals.

Programming Offered

Principals were asked "If no formal* SE programming of any sort is available to any of your students, please CHECK (✓) HERE ______ and go to (a subsequent item).

* 'incidental' teaching or counselling, for this survey, is not considered formal programming".

Two principals did not respond but 23 of the 37 respondents indicated no formal SE programming in their schools. Even in those schools with grade 7 or 8 enrolments (groups A and B in Table 10) the majority of their principals thought no planned programs existed. No direct comparison with teacher reportage can be made (because the samples were independently drawn, only 39 principals were in their survey but teachers were drawn from 53 schools for their survey). Nonetheless, as can be seen from Table 3 above (page 17), elementary teachers and principals are both clearly reporting that planned programs are the exception.

The data also suggest that SE program planning can (and presumably does) occur at any grade level including schools with only grade K-5 students. If there is any greater likelihood of finding SE program planning, then it is in K-8 and K-6 schools (the numbers are too small to permit statistical tests of differences).

Principals who indicated that SE program planning occurred in their schools were asked to "Estimate the percentage of students in your school who have SE programming" by grade groups.

Only two principals thought that programs were planned for students in K-2. The higher of the two estimates was 50 per cent, that is to say, for half of the students in this grade range.

Four principals thought SE programs were planned for the grade 3-5 students. Their estimates of the percentages of students in these grades in their own schools who were experiencing planned programs ran from 15 to 80.

Ten principals of the 32 schools with students in grades 6 or 7 or 8 thought these children had SE programs planned for them. Seven thought that 80 to 100 per cent of these youngsters had such programs, but two others thought only 15 and 30 per cent had such offerings. Direct comparisons between principals' and teachers' reports on planning are impossible. However more than half (23 of 44) of the grade 6-8 teachers polled said they planned SE programs (nine said that SE was a distinct program of instruction), as can be seen in Table 3, page 17. As less than a third of principals of schools with grade 6-8 students thought programs were planned, there probably is a considerable true discrepancy between what teachers report and what principals believe about SE. It may just be an artifact of the sampling differences, but the difference is large.

Principals were asked, "If your SE programs or the courses of which they are part have official titles, please give these and indicate the grade(s) covered by each".

No principal indicated more than one title. "Health" was the most frequently named course (four times) and one suspects that it could have been identified much more often. The grades indicated were 4 through 8. "Family Life", a program developed by staff and parents some nine years ago in the Markham TSA #2, was named twice. It is offered, it was said, in grades 7 and 8. However, no teacher identified this program by name in their survey. One principal identified a theme study "Adolescence", for grade 6 through 8, and indicated that SE was handled here.

Principals' Priorities For SE Topics

Teachers were asked which SE topics they dealt with (see above, pages 18 and following). Principals were given an identical list of 43 topics and asked to indicate how much priority they would give each in the various grade groupings in their own school. The priority scale was High (H), Medium (M), Low (L), and

Not Suitable (NS). The relevant grade groupings were K-2, 3-5, 6-8, but not all principals had every grouping in his or her school. Since the absolute number of respondents varies due to two factors (grades in school and a very small number of "no response" instances), figures are presented as percentages. The maximum number of respondents for each grade grouping is:

K to 2 = 31 3 to 5 = 29 6 to 8 = 31.

TABLE 11: Priority Given By Principals to Selected SE Topics, As Percentages

			...for inclusion in grades		
	Topic	Priority	K-2 (n=31)	3-5 (n=29)	6-8 (n=31)
1.	Conception and birth	High	7	10	48
		Med.	13	31	32
		Low	48	35	10
		N.S.	32	24	10
2.	Heredity and genetics	High	0	0	26
		Med.	0	24	48
		Low	33	38	13
		N.S.	67	38	13
3.	Human sexual organs	High	0	0	38
		Med.	3	21	45
		Low	37	41	10
		N.S.	60	38	7
4.	Puberty	High	0	7	65
		Med.	3	31	29
		Low	21	28	6
		N.S.	76	34	0
5.	Gender identity	High	6	14	16
		Med.	20	31	49
		Low	47	38	32
		N.S.	27	17	3

(continued)

TABLE 11 (cont'd.)

		...for inclusion in grades		
Topic	Priority	K-2 (n=31)	3-5 (n=29)	6-8 (n=31)
6. Dating	High	0	0	23
	Med.	0	4	52
	Low	10	25	16
	N.S.	90	71	9
7. Being accepted by significant others	High	59	70	68
	Med.	29	26	32
	Low	6	0	0
	N.S.	6	4	0
8. Sex outside marriage	High	0	0	0
	Med.	0	0	13
	Low	10	7	20
	N.S.	90	93	67
9. Venereal disease	High	0	0	16
	Med.	0	4	45
	Low	7	18	29
	N.S.	93	78	10
10. Unmarried mother	High	0	0	10
	Med.	3	7	26
	Low	13	14	29
	N.S.	84	79	35
11. Parenthood	High	10	14	17
	Med.	10	10	40
	Low	10	14	27
	N.S.	69	62	17
12. Parent-child relations	High	38	54	55
	Med.	24	29	35
	Low	14	14	10
	N.S.	24	4	0

(continued)

TABLE 11 (cont'd.)

		...for inclusion in grades		
Topic	Priority	K-2 (n=31)	3-5 (n=29)	6-8 (n=31)
13. Sibling relations	High	52	62	68
	Med.	27	24	29
	Low	10	14	3
	N.S.	10	0	0
14. Menstruation	High	4	3	74
	Med.	0	34	23
	Low	4	21	3
	N.S.	93	41	0
15. Masturbation	High	3	3	23
	Med.	0	10	35
	Low	7	10	26
	N.S.	90	76	16
16. Human sexual response	High	0	0	6
	Med.	0	4	35
	Low	4	7	32
	N.S.	96	89	26
17. Youth and the law	High	14	29	67
	Med.	18	32	19
	Low	32	21	10
	N.S.	36	18	3
18. Child molestation	High	24	38	52
	Med.	31	41	32
	Low	28	13	13
	N.S.	17	7	3
19. Pornography	High	0	7	13
	Med.	0	7	20
	Low	14	18	37
	N.S.	86	68	30

(continued)

TABLE 11 (cont'd.)

			...for inclusion in grades		
	Topic	Priority	K-2 (n=31)	3-5 (n=29)	6-8 (n=31)
20.	Homosexuality	High	0	0	10
		Med.	4	7	23
		Low	14	22	40
		N.S.	82	70	27
21.	Alcohol and drug use	High	0	4	61
		Med.	7	21	26
		Low	17	36	6
		N.S.	76	39	6
22.	Leaving home	High	0	4	10
		Med.	3	7	10
		Low	7	7	32
		N.S.	90	82	48
23.	Choosing a marriage partner	High	0	0	3
		Med.	0	4	10
		Low	7	7	19
		N.S.	93	89	68
24.	Preparation for the wedding	High	0	0	0
		Med.	0	0	3
		Low	7	7	10
		N.S.	93	93	87
25.	Legal aspects of marriage	High	0	0	0
		Med.	0	0	3
		Low	3	7	6
		N.S.	97	93	90
26.	Family economics	High	0	0	6
		Med.	3	21	42
		Low	24	25	19
		N.S.	73	54	32

(continued)

TABLE 11 (cont'd.)

	Topic	Priority	...for inclusion in grades K-2 (n=31)	 3-5 (n=29)	 6-8 (n=31)
27.	Factors conducive to a happy marriage	High	0	0	10
		Med.	7	14	10
		Low	14	14	35
		N.S.	79	72	45
28.	Religion and the family	High	3	7	6
		Med.	21	29	29
		Low	28	32	32
		N.S.	48	32	32
29.	Marriage breakdown, counselling	High	0	0	6
		Med.	3	7	13
		Low	7	7	10
		N.S.	90	86	71
30.	Family planning concept	High	0	0	7
		Med.	0	4	3
		Low	7	4	23
		N.S.	93	93	67
31.	Birth control methods	High	0	0	7
		Med.	0	0	23
		Low	3	3	26
		N.S.	97	97	45
32.	Abortion	High	0	0	0
		Med.	0	0	29
		Low	0	4	42
		N.S.	100	96	29
33.	Values and lifestyles	High	31	32	45
		Med.	24	46	32
		Low	24	7	13
		N.S.	21	14	10

(continued)

TABLE 11 (cont'd.)

	Topic	Priority	...for inclusion in grades K-2 (n=31)	3-5 (n=29)	6-8 (n=31)
34.	Different kinds of families	High	27	27	37
		Med.	30	46	37
		Low	33	19	13
		N.S.	11	8	13
35.	Community standards of behaviour	High	41	54	65
		Med.	28	36	29
		Low	24	11	3
		N.S.	7	0	3
36.	Marriage as a social institution	High	3	4	13
		Med.	3	18	30
		Low	33	36	37
		N.S.	60	43	20
37.	The woman in society	High	7	11	35
		Med.	34	50	45
		Low	34	21	10
		N.S.	24	18	10
38.	The physically handicapped	High	21	25	39
		Med.	41	57	42
		Low	28	11	10
		N.S.	10	7	10
39.	Mental health and managing stress	High	14	14	29
		Med.	7	21	26
		Low	21	29	35
		N.S.	59	36	10
40.	Community services offering help in health and family problems	High	3	4	13
		Med.	3	11	32
		Low	17	18	35
		N.S.	76	68	19

(continued)

TABLE 11 (cont'd.)

	Topic	Priority	...for inclusion in grades K-2 (n=31)	3-5 (n=29)	6-8 (n=31)
41.	The young single adult	High	3	0	6
		Med.	0	7	10
		Low	7	7	26
		N.S.	90	86	58
42.	Theories of personality	High	0	0	13
		Med.	4	14	13
		Low	18	24	32
		N.S.	79	62	42
43.	Sex techniques	High	0	0	0
		Med.	0	4	3
		Low	0	0	3
		N.S.	100	96	94

One might wish to return to pages 18 through 22 to see what percentages of teachers are dealing with these topics and to refresh memories of the topics with relatively "high" or "medium" coverage rates (page 21).

It seems clear that the topics with highest priority from the principals relate to social adjustment and conformity (numbers 7, 12, 13, 34, 35, 38) and prudential concerns for staying out of harm's way (numbers 17, 18, 21). "Values and life-styles" was a topic of medium-high priority for principals just as it was a topic of "medium" coverage percentage as reported by the teachers.

The "tailing off" phenomenon noted for actual coverage (page 21) was not found in connection with principals' high priority topics. In fact, for principals, topics of highest priority in K-2 are still of highest priority for 6-8.

It seems clear that most topics most clearly and closely identified with SE (as distinct from FLE, for instance) are not granted high priority by the majority of principals. Except for "Puberty" and "Menstruation" (at grades 6 to 8), major SE topics were seen as of low, middling, or no priority by the majority.

There may be some internal contradictions in the reported priorities. For example, for grades 6-8, the topic "Conception and birth" was given high or medium priority by 80 per cent of the sample. But only 10 per cent thought the "Family planning concept" of similar priority while 67 per cent thought the topic "Not Suitable". One might live with the somewhat difficult-to-reconcile emphasis on teaching about birth but not teaching about birth control (especially with teenagers). However, 30 per cent of the sample thought that "Birth control methods" was a topic of high or medium priority. Question: How does one teach methods if the concept behind the methods is not taught? Answer: Very poorly.

One might ask why, in the light of reports from public health authorities of increasing incidences of venereal disease (as well as pregnancy) among young teenagers, two in five elementary principals rank teaching about VD to grade 6-8 students of of low priority or not suitable. One principal did suggest an answer to this at the conclusion of the survey, in suggesting that this (and all sex education) is a problem for the home and "the other social agencies" and that the "York Region Health" should get on the ball. Such suggestions have to be examined if for no other reason than the obvious fact the SE is not viewed by many principals as a high priority in their schools.

Principals' Views on Scope, Organization, Needs, and Outcomes of SE

Principals were asked to respond to the same 15 statements presented to teachers, giving their opinions on matters relating to the nature of SE programming. Both groups were asked how strongly they agreed or disagreed with the 15 assertions which touched on SE's scope and focus (items #1, 5, 7, 10), on organization and presentation matters (#4, 6, 9, 11), on teachers' needs (#2, 3, and 9 again), on the reactions of students or parents to SE (#8, 12), and on the outcomes of SE.

The two samplings of opinion can be compared as both groups are representative of the general populations of teachers and principals. (Teachers' opinions are summarized on pages 35-40, especially in Table 9, page 36 but note that the opinions of teachers of "junior" and "senior" grades were tallied separately.)

TABLE 12: Principals' Views on Selected Aspects of SE, As Percentage

Key: SA/SD = Strongly Agree/Disagree
TA/TD = Tend to Agree/Disagree
N = Neither Agree Nor Disagree
NR = No Response

	Statements	SA	TA	N	TD	SD	NR
1.	SE is a necessary subject for students at all grades	18	36	13	18	10	5
2.	There is a need for more teacher in-service training	62	26	5	3	3	3
3.	There is a need for more SE instructional materials	46	38	8	0	5	3
4.	SE should be interdisciplinary and should be integrated with other programs	41	33	8	13	3	3
5.	The main focus in SE should be on living rather than sex	62	28	3	3	0	5

(continued)

	Statements	SA	TA	N	TD	SD	NR
6.	SE should not be a school subject; it should be handled by sex counselling and incidental teaching	13	18	15	38	8	8
7.	Give SE as early as possible	23	31	23	15	8	0
8.	The SE program is misunderstood by parents and lacks support	3	62	13	13	3	8
9.	There is a need for smaller classes for SE discussion	8	33	31	15	5	8
10.	Morals, religion should be emphasized in SE	13	23	28	26	5	5
11.	SE should be given to boys and girls together	13	41	23	10	5	8
12.	Students are very receptive and sensible about SE	21	38	28	5	3	5
13.	SE programming significantly increases students' knowledge	26	51	13	5	0	5
14.	As a result of SE programming, students show more liberal attitudes on sex	3	23	46	10	13	5
15.	Students' behaviours are more responsible as a result of SE programming	5	38	49	3	3	3

Addressing statements on the scope and focus of SE (1, 5, 7, 10), by better than two-to-one the principals agreed that sex education "is a necessary subject for students at all grades". But nearly one-in-five did not respond or answered "N" (neither agree nor disagree). As we shall see in the next section, some principals spoke strongly against this statement. Teachers agreed, by a three-to-one ratio, with the view stated in number 1.

There was little disagreement with the view that "The main focus in SE should be on living rather than sex", but again principals were less in agreement than were teachers.

Number 7 statement sought to complement number 1, approaching the question of scope from another angle. Again by about two-to-one principals thought SE needed to be commenced from earliest school days.

The question of the roles of "morals" and "religion" divide principals, but not quite as much as it splits teachers. As with the teachers, several principals wrote in support for a moral aspect to SE but rejected religion as a valid basis. More will be said about this later and some of the comments made by elementary teachers (see page 38) were echoed by principals.

As for the organization of SE and matters of presentation, there was a clear preference (74 per cent) for integration of SE with other programs (number 4), and physical and health education was specifically named by two respondents.

About half of the respondents were not content to leave SE to incidental teaching or counselling but about a third agreed with statement number 6. About a third of teachers also agreed. Again, this seems to be the stance of those dealing with younger students.

On the matter of smaller classes being needed for SE discussions (number 9), principals were somewhat less inclined to agree than were teachers. This may reflect concerns of principals for PTR, accommodations, etc.

Whether "SE should be given to boys and girls together" (statement 11) once more brought some "it depends" responses. Principals were slightly more in agreement with this position than teachers of grades 6-8. Even more principals

(31 per cent) than teachers (25 per cent) could not decide either way on this matter. "It depends" is probably the best answer.

Only 16 per cent of principals disagreed with the statement 3, that "The SE program is misunderstood by parents and lacks support" but that is still twice the percentage of teachers holding this judgment.

Three-in-five principals agreed that "Students are very receptive and sensible about SE" (statement 12) and only three actually disagreed. They are in accord with teachers.

Teachers' needs (statements 2, 3, 9) were not, except for class size, matters which divided the principals. Eighty-eight per cent thought more teacher in-service was needed and 84 per cent saw a need for more instructional materials. The teachers themselves did not see these needs quite as strongly. As noted earlier (page 40), a needs analysis or clarification seems called for.

Principals' Recommendations for Further Consideration

At the conclusion of the survey principals were invited to make any observations about SE programming they thought important. Thirteen of 39 respondents offered 18 views and recommendations. (Three others wrote about their difficulties in wrestling with certain questions.)

The opinions on and recommendations for SE programming are not so extensive that reporting the essence of all will take much space.

The most frequently voiced concerns were for the needs of children and for help for teachers if they were to offer effective SE activities. "Honest answers" to children's questions were seen as essential. One principal wrote than "An important element in SE is giving the answers to children's questions when they are asked."

Responding to children's questions were viewed as "high priority" in programming. This suggests the need for flexibility in both the programs and the teachers. Another respondent wrote, "There is no taboo subject when taught in the proper context". Two other principals observed that SE must begin as early as possible and needs to be taught in every grade.

To accomplish a good SE program, in-service training of teachers is required. One principal thought "specialized personnel" were required. Some training had to be geared to helping teachers attain a higher "comfort level ... if they are to leave positive impressions", according to two principals. "Comfortable" may have several connotations. Perhaps the most significant one was in the mind of the principal who wrote, "I have one real concern — We have a lot of teachers with sexual hang-ups. That would be a real problem ... to deal with."

Two principals of schools for the Trainable Mentally Retarded offered insights into student needs that are not necessarily unique to teachers bearing such special responsibilities. "We do not prepare our young people for marriage," wrote one, "but think in 'protective' terms." Considering the present social concern for unwanted outcomes of teenage sexuality, it is surprising that there was so little directly-stated concern for protecting the young, especially girls, from exploitation. Another TMR school principal wrote that, "...great emphasis should be placed on emotional value systems and leading them (students) toward developing their own value systems. A study of how life styles and values develop — Making responsible decisions."

A prime teacher need is a set of board-sanctioned guidelines. While there is some difference of opinion about what might be covered by such a guide, the suggestions made are these (each usually by only one respondent):

(a) a guide to what can be handled incidentally at various ages;

(b) a guide to what can be handled formally at various ages;

(c) a guide that has been tested to determine its acceptability to students, parents, staff, community;

(d) a guide that can be used with the community to explain what the schools are doing;

(e) a guide that will avoid biases that are "too broad" or "too narrow";

(f) a guide that will eliminate religious piousness, moralizing, and personal biases, but will allow the students to ask and discover where their teachers stand, as persons, on relevant issues.

Some principals do not see SE as an offering in its own right. One thinks "it must be part of a wide family life type of program ... quite structured and little latitude left an individual teacher". Another thought "SE should ... be part of the PHE program plus a special service for students who may require sex counselling".

One principal may have been voicing a more general concern, as discussed in the report of some elementary teachers' views, when writing "There is some good in it (SE) but it is also noticeable that some appetites are developed as a result of lessons". If the appetite is manifest as irresponsible behaviour, then only two principals saw this, as the responses to statement 15 (Table 12) show.

Two principals saw little or no place for formal SE programs in the schools. One wrote, with respect to the Primary Division, "Other things are more important". Another expressed a very strong feeling that teachers have enough to do to teach the basics (presumably SE is not seen as basic). "Let the other social agencies get on the ball ... York Regional Health should do this." This principal thought the schools could cooperate but that the family and church also need to lend a hand, instead of shirking.

While this latter view is not commonly put forth by educators (or others), it may merit serious consideration notwithstanding the Ministry of Education's present policies and guidelines. The Carnegie Council on Children, through a task force, has just addressed itself to this sort of matter. In All Our Children: The American Family Under Pressure (1977), authors Kenneth Keniston and the Council observe that the myth that "families are free-standing, independent, and autonomous units" must be abandoned. "Parents have not abdicated -- they have been dethroned" from their traditional roles with their children as the result of forces beyond their control. Raising children today is fraught with difficulties and perils which even the most earnest parents cannot control. The burden of child-raising has, and ought to be, more widely distributed, says their report.

But an opposite position is taken by Christopher Lasch in Haven in a Heartless World (1977). Lasch agrees that the family is besieged and has lost its authority. This is the core of the problem of contemporary child-raising, Lasch says. Fragmentation of the functions of child-raising will weaken still further "one of the principal sources of social cohesion" -- the family.

The question, it seems, is not so much whether the schools and others may do a less adequate job than the family in raising healthy children. Rather it is a matter of whether to shore up the crumbling myth of the self-sufficient family or to opt for the myth of the omnicompetent state.

IV FINDINGS OF THE SURVEY OF SECONDARY TEACHERS

While some readers' interests will be exclusively with Sex Education programming in the secondary school, it is desirable -- perhaps essential -- that they read at least Parts I and II of this report before proceeding to this section. Much material equally relevant to the elementary and secondary panels is reported only in those first two parts.

Guidelines and Policies Followed by Teachers

Unlike their colleagues in the Primary and Junior Divisions (kindergarten through grade 6),teachers of the Intermediate (grades 7-10) and Senior (grades 11-13) Divisions have no program policy document like The Formative Years to provide a general guide to their responsibility for Family Life/Sex Education. Instead, the great majority of teachers surveyed in this study pointed to one or more particular Intermediate or Senior Division subject guidelines as the bases or authorities for their programming.

Six other respondents (almost entirely those teaching grade 7 or 8 students housed in secondary schools, apparently) did cite TFY (three instances) or other Ministry or locally-devised guidelines intended for the younger students. Two others gave no indication as to guidelines or policies followed.

As stated earlier, this survey sought only to poll those teachers whose duties could reasonably be assumed to include responsibility for Family Life/Sex Education (FL/SE) instruction or counselling. These teachers had timetables entirely composed of assignments in Physical and Health Education, for example, or in Family Studies or Guidance or such subjects in combination. More will be said about teaching assignments later.

Some teachers identified two guidelines indicating teaching assignments across two divisions (for example, PHE in both the Intermediate and Senior Divisions) or responsibilities in more than one subject area (Home Economics and Family Studies, for instance).

The guideline most frequently cited (50 times) was Physical and Health Education for the Intermediate Division. Its provisions for SE are described in some detail in Part II of this report.

So too are the relevant sections of the Intermediate Division course in Family Studies, cited 22 times by secondary respondents. The new curriculum guideline for the Senior Division Family Studies was not distributed by the Ministry of Education until well after this survey (a brief note on this guideline appears below). Two teachers specifically named the family studies guideline prepared by the York County Board of Education.

Guidelines for the Man in Society course for grade 11 or 12 provide opportunities for family studies and topics such as courtship, marriage customs, and development of ethical values, but this guideline was not cited. However, only a very small number of teachers of this course were included in this survey.

Five indicated that their own school had guidelines in the FL/SE area though no particulars were given. Three respondents said they followed the program prepared by the Toronto Board and two others reported using the London Board of Education sex education program. Two others cited the York County Board's curriculum aid Changing Roles in a Changing World as a guide.

One teacher cited a grade 11 Biology program for the teaching of genetics and heredity. Three reported using the Ministry of National Health and Welfare SE guidelines.

Three Senior Division guidelines are used by a total of some 60 per cent of the respondents.

Least used is the senior Guidance guideline (S:5) which was reported by only four respondents. One also reported using the intermediate Guidance guideline (I:3). Once again a revision was on its way to schools when the survey was made but, like Family Studies, the Senior Division Guidance guidelines arrived after the poll was completed. Like Family Studies, the Guidance document is reviewed below to see what is now provided for by way of SE programming guidelines.

The Senior Division Home Economics guideline (RP-S.6) has been intended for grades 11 and 12, but the program is available to those in grade 13 as S.6 (13), according to some of the 24 teachers who cited these as bases of their FL/SE programming. These guidelines stress the importance of the family as the basic unit of society, with topics such as the woman in society included. Programs appear to have developed considerably from their RP-S.6 and S.6 origins and, as of 1978, are superceded by the new Family Studies senior document just now being disseminated. The new guidelines provide for a historical overview of such topics as courtship and mate selection, sexual and familial controls, and values of society (pp.58-59) and socialization into familial roles -- including masculine and feminine, child-bearing and parenting -- (p.60). But the orientation is to family studies and, by-and-large, sex education is a minor part of the program.

Fifty respondents, more than half of the Secondary teachers in the sample, cited the Senior Division Physical and Health Education guidelines as a basis for their FL/SE programming. These guidelines, released with considerable fanfare by the Minister himself in April 1975, authorize a sequence of curricular content not only for grades 11-13, but from kindergarten on up, and reinforces the same programming as was permitted by the intermediate PHE document in 1973 (see Part II of this report). There is in this document authority and guidance for teachers not only to permit but to encourage (if not direct) that FL/SE topics such as the following be taught:

> human families (courtship, marriage, family planning, child-rearing, marriage breakdown, divorce);
>
> sexuality (the nature of love, gender identity, male/female roles, sexual response, standards of sexual behavior, sex and the law);
>
> values and valuing (the valuing processes, analysis of values issues);
>
> venereal disease (epidemiology, treatment, social aspects and the law, individual responsibility);
>
> anatomy and physiology (mainly just a continuation of what should have been begun before the intermediate grades);
>
> human growth and development (pregnancy, birth, endocrinology, and the biological male and female).

The teaching aids and resources drawn to teacher's attention by this guideline, like those in so many of the Ministry's recent guides, are fully identified and it is clear how they fit in the curriculum. The claim of some respondents that teaching resources are hard to find is contradicted by such lists.

Another claim which could be re-examined in the light of the new Senior Division Guidance guidelines is that counselling has a FL/SE function. The new document supercedes not only guideline S:5 (senior) but also I:3 (the intermediate document). Earlier studies have assumed that high school guidance staff have played a significant role in sex education (but see E.S. Herold*) The York County survey acted on this assumption but found counsellors denying any significant responsibility or activity in this topic. The old guidelines tended to support their interpretation of their assignments. What do the new guidelines show?

The general charge to guidance staff is "to assist students in making informal decisions leading to productive and rewarding lives...to develop into integrated, competent, and socially responsible persons..." (P.2). Self-awareness and coping skills are to be developed. The range of life skills needed is considerable and the understanding and awareness of the limitations imposed by sex stereotyping". Group work programs should help students develop "satisfactory relationships with others." But the context is general, not specifically to sexual adjustments. Social adjustment (to self, family, friends, community) is to be promoted as early as in grade 7 units, but nothing explicit suggests that FL/SE is intended. The "teen-age world" units in grade 8 similarly are nondirective as to the content of the problems and fears that attend coming-of-age.

In short, while the guidance counsellor might assist students in the FL/SE area, there is virtually nothing which explicitly demands this, apparently, in the Guidance document now being circulated.

The Respondents and Their Teaching Assignments

To what has already been said on this matter several notable facts should be reviewed before the teachers' responses are studied.

The 99 respondents taught (or counselled) in 15 secondary schools, two of which housed "elementary" students (grade 8's principally but grade 7's also in the periods for which some questions were asked). Some grade 7 and 8 students also are bused to high schools for Home Economics.

---

* See "Sex Education in Ontario Secondary Schools" in Reporting Classroom Research, V,1 (Jan./Feb. 1976)

TABLE 13: Grade Assignments of Survey Respondents

Grade	No.	Staff	By Division	
7	4	Either 7 or 8 = 22	Teaching Principally in the Intermediate Division = 51	Total = 99
8	22			
9	81	Either 9 or 10 = 84		
10	76			
12	69	Either 11, 12, or 13= 89	Teaching Principally in 11, 12, 13 = 48	
13	29			

All respondents have teaching or counselling duties across two or more grades. Several have responsibilities across six grades, for example, as department heads. And many actually report teaching at five grade levels. This can be understood to reflect "mixed grade" or "ungraded" offerings, subjects which can be taken by students nominally enrolled in different "years", according to the number of credits already gained, for instance.

About 55 per cent of the respondents had time tables exclusively or mainly consisting of Physical and Health Education programs. About 20 per cent had timetables exclusively of Home Economics or a mix of Home Economics and Family Studies. Almost as many had guidance assignments. The rest had timetables combining these subjects or Man in Society.

For purposes of some tentative analyses, teachers have been grouped for "principal" assignment. Those with half or more of their classes in the Senior Division total 48. See the Table above and the following subsection.

The Approach to Planning SE Programs

While SE is not a subject, it is provided for in several courses. How is SE programming planned? Is planning more "systematic" in the Senior Division? How many teachers make specific preparation for teaching FL/SE?

Secondary teachers were asked to indicate which descriptor best describes their approach to SE programming. Results were tallied, as below, after respondents were designated (somewhat arbitrarily) as "principally intermediate" or "principally grades 11, 12, 13" in order to see how, if at all, the level taught affected planning.

TABLE 14: Planning Approaches, By Division

Approach	Principally Intermediate	Principally Gr. 11-13	Total
A distinct program of instruction	15	16	31
A planned program, but integrated into another subject or program	20	16	36
Taught "incidentally", as need arises, or at "teachable moment"	8	13	21
Basically "hit-and-miss"	0	0	0
"Not applicable" or No Response"	8	3	11
Totals	51	48	99

From these data, it seems that proportionately the same percentage of "intermediate" and "senior" teachers plan their SE programming. The "senior" (grades 11-13) teachers had the majority of the guidance counsellors and they tend to report a "hit-and-miss" or "teachable moment" approach or give no response.

Sixty-seven per cent overall claim to make specific preparation for their FL/SE programs: this percentage includes virtually all the teachers of PHE and about half of the Home Economics teachers.

Topics Covered by Secondary Teachers

Respondents were asked to indicate which of a list of 43 topics they dealt with in their classes (or counselling, by inference). They were also asked to show which topics were taught to boys only or girls only. Since PHE is largely taught in sexually segregated classes, and Home Economics and Family Life classes characteristically register significantly greater numbers of girls than boys, it was not as easy as in the elementary school to determine whether there was sex bias in the topics selected for boys and girls.

The following tabulation shows the percentage of respondents who deal with each topic. The base in each grade grouping is the number of teachers in the survey who have assignments with these grades (22, 84, and 89 for grades 7-8, 9-10, 11-13 respectively, as tabulated earlier).

The provisos which precede Table 4 should be reread before analysing these findings.

TABLE 15: Topics Taught, By Grade Group, As Percentages

	GRADE GROUPS		
TOPIC	6 - 8*	9 - 10	11 - 13
1. Conception and birth	0	67	28
2. Heredity and genetics	0	36	33
3. Human sexual organs	27	40	15
4. Puberty	36	57	8
5. Gender identity or sex roles	27	32	71

*Grade 7-8 students housed/taught in secondary schools

(continued)

TABLE 15 (continued)

TOPIC	GRADE GROUPS 6 - 8*	9 - 10	11 - 13
6. Dating and going steady	0	48	65
7. Being accepted by significant others	32	48	54
8. Sex outside of marriage	0	13	46
9. Venereal diseases	23	63	36
10. The unmarried mother	0	20	60
11. Parenthood and child care	14	25	62
12. Parent-Child relations	32	38	63
13. Sibling relations	32	31	49
14. Menstruation	36	60	15
15. Masturbation	14	23	12
16. Human sexual response	0	23	37
17. Youth and the law	0	17	29
18. Child Molestation	0	4	10
19. Pornography	0	2	4
20. Homosexuality	0	17	29
21. Alcohol and drug use	5	71	30
22. Leaving home, setting up home	0	17	61
23. Choosing a marriage partner	0	7	89
24. Preparation for the wedding	0	2	49
25. Legal aspects of marriage	0	4	60

*Grade 7-8 students housed/taught in secondary schools

(continued)

TABLE 15 (continued)

		GRADE GROUPS	
TOPIC	6 - 8*	9 - 10	11 - 13
26. Family economics	0	12	66
27. Factors conducive to a happy marriage	0	8	73
28. Religion and the family	0	6	20
29. Marriage breakdown, counselling	0	9	54
30. Family planning concept	0	30	55
31. Birth control methods	0	49	48
32. Abortion	0	25	61
33. Values and lifestyles	5	36	82
34. Different kinds of families	0	8	57
35. Community standards of behaviour	0	14	38
36. Marriage as a social institution	0	6	54
37. The woman in society	0	24	61
38. The physically handicapped	0	7	16
39. Mental health and managing stress	0	32	58
40. Community services offering help in health and family problems	0	35	54
41. The young single adult	0	6	37
42. Theories of personality	0	15	52
43. Sex techniques	0	1	2
** 44. Rape	0	1	1

* Grade 7 - 8 students housed/taught in secondary schools

** Write-in by respondent

The very low percentages for the topics in grades 6-8 may reflect several conditions singly or in combination. Most of the 22 respondents who indicated responsibilities for grade 8 students in the high schools were either Home Economics or Guidance staff: they tended to offer little or no "mainline" SE program but some FLE.

In grades 9-10 the topics with relatively "high" percentages seem to be associated closely with adolescent development, including physical changes, social and sexual life, "the facts of life", and "avoiding problems":

puberty (57%)
menstruation (60%)
being accepted by others (48%)
dating and going steady (48%)
birth control methods (49%)
conception and birth (67%)
venereal disease (63%)

For comparison, it might be noted that 71 per cent of the respondents who teach at the grade 9-10 level report dealing with "alcohol and drug use".

At the grade 11-13 level, the topics taught by the majority of respondents seem to have a greater concern for "concepts", as distinct from "technical data", as can be seen by listing the eleven topics most taught:

choosing a marriage partner (89%)
values and lifestyles (82%)
factors conducive to a happy marriage (73%)
gender identity or sex roles (71%)
family economics (66%)
dating and going steady (65%)
parent-child relations (63%)
parenthood and child care (62%)
leaving home, setting up home (61%)
abortion (61%)
the woman in society (61%)

These are not generally topics which involve a high degree of fact-mongering, like physiology. Rather, they deal with relationships and issues, with psychosocial development at key points in maturing (leaving home, starting a family unit and maintaining it, for instance).

The evidence is unclear, but it tends to indicate that prior to grade 11, high school girls are more likely to be taught these topics than boys:

conception and birth
the unmarried mother
parenthood and child care
parent-child relations
sibling relations
family planning concept
birth control methods
theories of personality.

At this level, boys are more likely than girls to be taught about masturbation, homosexuality, alcohol and drug use.

In the senior grades, 11 through 13, the majority of instruction appears to be given in sexually segregated classes. At this stage there is some evidence that topics already dealt with in girl's classes are now raised or re-raised with the boys, for example, birth control and the family planning concept, venereal disease and abortion.

Time Given to Sex Education

Notes on the possible significance of time given to SE programs, and how it is given, appear in Part II of this report. A case was made there for "grouping" the data, rather than just calculating averages. Similar concerns exist for the secondary school responses to the question "How much time (minutes per month) is usually given to SE in the grade(s) you teach?"

The first concern is for the number who could not estimate the time given. Only nine (of 22) who taught or counselled grades 7-8 in the high schools reported, and one value (240 minutes) seems very far out of line given a 34 minute average for the other eight.

The 47 time allotments reported for grades 9-10 seem to offer several recurrent values, 0, 20, 60, and 90 minutes. The average, 57 minutes, tends to conceal the number of very low values (the zeroes and near-zeroes) and some very high values (160 was reported twice and 210 minutes once).

Since 37 teachers with grade 9 or 10 students failed to report, the average and distributions can only be best guesses about the time actually given.

In the Senior Division, a number of consistent values occur in the 51 (of a possible 89) time reports. These values, 0, 20, 40, 60, 80-90, and 120, may correlate with "no program", "hit-and-miss", "incidental", and "planned programs". Several extreme values (400,600 minutes per month) were discarded due to lack of other evidence that eight to 10 hours per month all year was given by any teacher to FL/SE programming. (It is possible to see a Home Economics program concentrating on family studies but probably not to the exclusion of all other topics). An average of 78 minutes can be derived but, once again, this disguises the great range of reported times. However, it shows clearly that some of these 51 teachers spend considerable time on FL/SE.

Level at Which SE Programs are Offered

The question "What is the approximate 'mix' of students in the SE program(s) which you teach?" was taken from the CEA's national study referred to earlier. The data might have indicated whether students studying at the general level were more likely to opt for courses dealing with FL/SE.

There were too many ommissions to this question to warrant tabulation and analysis, however.

Teacher Training in Sex Education

Many factors go to make for successful programs: the program guide, teaching aids, time enough to do the job, etc. These are all "inputs" into the process. Perhaps the most important input is a competent teacher. Training is one antecedent of competence.

How well trained in SE are the respondents to this survey? To the question "Have you taken any formal training in SE?", 40 answered "Yes", 39 checked "No", and 20 gave no response.

Almost a majority who reported formal training indicated that they, like their elementary school counterparts, had been trained since 1970. But virtually the same number did not say, though asked, when they received instruction. Recency of training remains somewhat of a mystery, therefore.

The following tabulation indicates the sort of training situations which have contributed to these teachers' competence.

TABLE 16: Formal Training in Sex Education

Nature of Training	Number
(a) University undergrad course only	19
(b) (a) plus preservice training (FEVT)	8
(c) (a) plus inservice training (school board)	1
(d) (a) plus graduate course	1
(e) (d) plus preservice training	2
(f) (b) plus special courses (college level)	7
(g) graduate training only	1
(h) not reported	1

There is some discussion in Part II about why few elementary teachers are formally trained. While secondary teachers are trained in greater numbers, some of the same historic reasons for the failure of many practitioners to obtain formal training may hold for both panels.

Secondary teachers seem well aware of training needs. A later item, the statement "There is a need for more inservice SE training", found 83 teachers agreeing (54 of them "strongly") and only five disagreeing.

Many elementary teachers feel the gap between their competence and the demands of SE strongly, and say so. The gap is possibly not seen as so wide by secondary teachers, as the next subsection shows. Still, one wrote of a "real need for teacher training...especially for teachers who have been in the classroom for a while -- probably least if made available through the county and partly on school time."

How "Comfortable" Are Teachers with their SE Programs?

The typical secondary teacher is "comfortable" or "very comfortable" with his SE program whether he has one or not! One teacher was "uncomfortable", one "very uncomfortable", and two made no response. The rest were at ease.

The "uncomfortable" teachers supplied comments. What is offered is "too late for many students", wrote one. Another was distressed because "Ministry guidelines as interpreted by the YCBE discourage 'abortion' and birth control advocacy". While this teacher was uncomfortable with this perception (which may not be true, since the Board has yet to state an official position on such matters), the teacher brought in a medical doctor to discuss both topics. Not reported feeling uncomfortable due to limited competence.

Several teachers of Family Studies and Home Economics felt that needed directions from the Ministry and Board were lacking or "vague". One wrote, "If questions about sexuality are raised they should be answered", but was obviously uncertain whether this view was really supported not just by existing guidelines but also by local authorities or by parents.

As is clear from a question (dealt with later) put to the respondents, 35 teachers agree that SE programming is neither understood nor supported by parents (22 per cent think otherwise). But two in five respondents do not know, apparently, where parents stand. Similar results would possibly have been found if "community", "administrators", or "trustees" had been substituted for "parents". Yet this condition did not seem to create an uncomfortable climate for these respondents.

Resource Persons Used in SE Programs

The majority of secondary respondents, like their elementary colleagues, use one or more resource persons in their SE programming.

The secondary schools use a greater variety of resource persons than the elementary schools. This reflects, without question, the greater variety of topics and the greater expertise needed to deal with them, e.g., homosexuality, women's rights, marriage breakdown/ counselling.

The need for "expert testimony" was frequently noted for bringing in resource persons such as "new mother's". Other experts, such as Public Health Nurses or MD's, were brought in "to give breadth or depth" or simply "to discuss their work" or "at the request of the person or agency" or "to alert students to community problems and resources". There is little specific indication that these persons actually brought knowledge not shared by the teachers, and one or two respondents made the point that they themselves possessed the facts. However, the experts did "lend credibility", they thought.

Other resource persons were sought "to present different or opposing viewpoints", to stimulate thought and discussion, and to open for reconsideration matters on which some minds had closed.

Resource persons used prior to the current year are shown in the following table.

TABLE 17: Resource Persons Used

Title or Affiliation	No. of Teachers Using
Public Health, School, or Community Nurse	47
Medical doctor (including psychiatrists)	45
Social Worker	21
Family Life or Marriage Counsellor	18
Lawyer	10
"Birthright"/"Planned Parenthood"/"Right to Life"	7

(continued)

TABLE 17: (continued)

Title or Affiliation	No. of Teachers Using
Parents (new or expectant mothers)	6
Addiction Research Foundation/Alcoholics Anonymous	5
Police	3
Psychologist	3
Other board staff (e.g., counsellor)	3
Others ("Young singles", "homosexual", Women's Rights worker, health educator, "student author", banker, welfare recipient, Parents Anonymous worker, Rape Crisis Centre staff, rehabilitation worker)	1 each

Teaching Aids Used

Respondents were asked to identify the major books and up to three other teaching aids used in their SE programs.

A list of the texts and major supplementary references used by elementary and secondary teachers appears as Appendix C to this report. Eighty-one of the 97 titles were named exclusively by secondary teachers and only a few were named by both panels.

TABLE 18: Aids, other than books, used to teach SE

Aid	No. reporting use
* Films (8mm or 16 mm) and videotapes	47
** Filmstrips	14
Overhead projector transparencies	17
Mixed media lists	17
Journals, magazines, or newspapers	17
Audiotapes or records	10
Public health pamphlets	7
Other media (reported by two or more) e.g., charts, models, radio, questionnaires	7
Other methods (reported by two or more) e.g., visits, projects, sociodrama/skits	8

* See Appendix D

** See Appendix E

Of the 40 films named by elementary and secondary teachers, 24 (60 per cent) are available from the Board's Education Resource Centre Film Library.

Filmstrip usage is grossly under-reported (as are the other resources, most likely). This may be due to inability to recall exact titles or because only up to three teaching aids were asked for or due to faulty memory. Demands on filmstrips (or mixed media kits) held in the high schools are reported to be considerably more than is suggested by this survey. Quite likely the survey's wording resulted in under-reporting. However, the nature of the aids used is evident from what was presented.

Some attention should be given to the claim that "Up-to-date AV aids are hard to find," as one respondent put it.

Teachers and Parents

Respondents were asked two questions.

(1) "Please describe briefly how parents are informed of the SE program(s) you teach."

(2) "Briefly, what kinds of reaction to your SE programs are you getting from students, parents."

Answers to the first question indicate that little special effort is made to inform parents but that there are several easy means by which any interested parents may get information.

TABLE 19: How Parents are Informed about SE Programs

Means	No. Using
Student handbook, course option outline, etc.	27
Students (who have outlines) expected to inform parents	20
Info. available (sometimes displayed) at "Parents' Night"	11
Course descriptions, filed with principal, available	5
Permission forms (e.g., for a "special presentation") sent home describing the event	4
Nothing specifically done, except on request	10
No response to this question (largely from guidance teachers)	22

One could collate this information with teachers' views that parents do not understand SE programs and do not support them. One might also consider how many parents understand any other program, or much care to. Quite possibly more is done to explain SE or to seek permission to include students in SE "specials" (e.g., films) than for any other activity save those which take students off the school grounds or call for money from the home.

The reactions to SE programming (the second question) by parents give us more data with which to consider the relationship of home and school.

TABLE 20: Parents' Reactions to SE Programming

Response	No. Reporting
Respondents state "not applicable" or give no response	42
Respondents report "no reaction" whatsoever from parents	28
"Positive" reaction expressed by parents	18
Little or no negative reaction	9
"Mixed" (positive and negative) reaction	1
"Withdrew child for religious reasons"	1

The great number of "no responses" might call for cautious conclusions, still, it is hard not to feel that parents as a group, while not necessarily very supportive (out of lack of knowledge?) are certainly not very negative. Possibly twice as many who do know something of the programs are "positive" as compared with the "negatives".

How do the students react? Responses fall almost entirely into two categories:

(1)	Positive (interested, appreciative, enthusiastic excellent, enthusiastic, etc.)	67
(2)	"Not applicable" or no response	26

Only two teachers reported that "some students do not seem interested". Two other respondents noted that some students wanted more SE or that programming be commenced earlier. Three teachers saw their students as merely "acceptant" or giving "little or no reaction". Four observed initial shyness or embarrassment in some students.

Some secondary teachers elaborated on their own reactions, just as did their elementary colleagues. One thought that SE "can only be beneficial, especially to our younger high school students". Several thought that gearing topics to the students' readiness levels was essential (comments such as, "the psychology of love-sex could be discussed in later years of school"). Possibly there is some fear of "too much too soon" behind such observations.

There were no substantial arguments against offering SE put forward by secondary teachers. This is in marked contrast with the write-ins from some elementary staff.

Teachers' Views on the Scope, Organization, Needs, and Outcomes of SE

As described in Part II, the study collected teachers' opinions on five areas relevant to SE programming by means of their reactions to 15 statements contained in item XIV of the survey:

Topic	Statement Nos.
program scope and focus	1, 5, 7, 10
organization and presentation	4, 6, 9, 11
teacher needs	2, 3, 9
parent and student reactions	8, 12
program outcomes	13, 14, 15

The teachers were asked to indicate their degree of agreement/disagreement with the statements presented.

It was originally thought possible to tally responses of the teachers principally assigned to the Intermediate Division classes (grades 7-10) separately from the teachers of grades 11-13. However, the teachers commonly taught over a wide range of grades, as noted earlier. Moreover, even when a somewhat arbitrary assignment to intermediate or senior categories was made, the statement-by-statement results of the two tallies were so nearly identical that differences could reasonably be attributed to random factors (chance). Thus all results have been combined in the following tabulation.

TABLE 21: Teachers' Views on Selected Aspects of SE (99 Respondents)

Key: SA/SD = Strongly Agree/Disagree N = Neither Agree Nor Disagree
TA/TD = Tend to Agree/Disagree NR = No Response

	Statements	SA	TA	N	TD	SD	NR
1.	SE is a necessary subject for students at all grades	37	30	8	12	8	4
2.	There is a need for more teacher inservice SE training	54	29	7	3	2	2
3.	There is a need for more SE instructional materials	46	26	15	8	0	4

(continued)

Statements	SA	TA	N	TD	SD	NR
4. SE should be interdisciplinary and should be integrated with other programs	33	26	19	11	5	5
5. The main focus in SE should be on living rather than sex	54	31	6	4	1	3
6. SE should not be a school subject; it should be handled by sex counselling and incidental teaching	7	5	3	24	65	4
7. Give SE as early as possible	35	26	9	14	9	6
8. The SE program is misunderstood by parents and lacks support	11	24	38	14	8	4
9. There is a need for smaller classes for SE discussion	32	40	15	8	1	3
10. Morals, religion should be emphasized in SE	9	25	21	21	15	8
11. SE should be given to boys and girls together	23	36	18	13	3	6
12. Students are very receptive and sensible about SE	31	49	11	3	1	2
13. SE programming significantly increases students' knowledge	35	48	9	1	1	5
14. As a result of SE programming, students show more liberal attitudes on sex	2	13	35	30	15	4
15. Students' behaviours are more responsible as a result of SE programming	13	38	38	4	1	5

Statements 1, 5, 7, and 10 relate to the scope and focus of SE. Secondary teachers are, by-and-large, of the opinion that (1) SE is a necessary subject for students at all grades and should commence as early as possible, (2) the main focus should be on "living" rather than sex.

They are not agreed on the role of morals and religion in SE although a number wrote that morals, ethics, or values should have emphasis but not religion. Some not only elaborated on the need for a developmental program begun before senior public school level, but noted that qualified medical or family service personnel needed to be involved in mounting such programs. Several commented that preparation for a happy and productive life ought to be the overriding goal and that "learning the plumbing" was only a means. Ethical or moral interpersonal relationships are central.

Statements 4, 6, 9, and 11 were concerned with organization and presentation of SE programming. Secondary respondents, having previously (#1) seen SE "as a necessary subject" rejected overwhelmingly the notions of "incidental teaching" or "counselling" as adequate (#6). The majority also thought that "SE should be interdisciplinary" and integrated with other programs (#4). Nearly two-thirds thought smaller classes were needed for SE discussion. About 60 per cent think SE should be given to boys and girls together. Considerable changes in present practices seem to be called for by these responses.

Teacher needs (statements 2, 3, and 9) have all been dealt with but a brief review may serve to recall matters. Only five reject the statement that "There is need for more teacher inservice SE training". Only eight disagree as to the need for more SE instructional materials. And only nine respondents rejected the need for smaller classes. (We assume that the teacher who reported 47 students in his or her class was not reporting the typical class load.)

Parent and student reactions have also been reviewed in an earlier section but there is some elaboration possible from thinking about the responses to statements 8 and 12. It is notable that 38 teachers neither agreed nor disagreed with the view that parents neither understand nor support the SE programs. How, in fact, can one know about this given the little communication which seems to exist about SE programming?

As to students' reactions, only four respondents seem to say that students are not "very receptive and sensible about SE" and perhaps it is the modifier "very" that influences their judgment.

The evidence of other studies (of students) is that there is universal receptivity with respect to SE at the high school level, initial self-consciousness notwithstanding. This study adds the judgment that students are also "sensible" about the subject. This seems to directly contradict the view that if students are taught in school about sex they will then act irresponsibly.

What are the outcomes of SE programming, according to the teachers? The matter of "effectiveness" of programs was dealt with earlier, in the report of the elementary teachers' survey. This study used the approach of the CEA, asking for evaluation of three statements (13, 14, 15) which dealt with three areas (1) knowledge, (2) attitudes, and (3) behaviors. The inherent ambiguity of statement 14 was noted in the Introduction to this report.

Only two teachers reported that they could not agree that "SE programming significantly increases students knowledge" but another 14 either couldn't or wouldn't say. It is not known how many teachers give "factual knowledge" exams, of course, but some of the 83 must have more than intuition on which to base their opinions.

Forty-five teachers think students "show more liberal attitudes on sex." It is hard to know what "liberal" is taken to mean. All humanistic education liberates one from ignorance or prejudice. "Liberal attitudes" in that context means attitudes freely arrived at and held in the face of critical analysis of those attitudes. Perhaps this is what this statement refers to.

Fifty-one respondents thought students' behaviors more responsible as a result of SE programming. Only five said otherwise. Forty-three may not be in a position to know. This is perhaps reasonable inasmuch as the appropriate behaviors may not be readily observable to teachers who do not see all students regularly or continuously (e.g., counsellors)nor see them in situations where the appropriate behaviors are called forth.

For Further Thought

There were several sorts of additional remarks supplied by respondents.

One type called for much direction as well as support from local authorities. Among those things requested by way of support was an indication that SE was an important or basic part of preparing for life. Fleshing out of guidelines was requested only twice but both requests included calls for parent input and Board sanction of the program guide which would evolve. A (probably) related call for support was for a follow-up survey "in more detail (to avoid misrepresentation)" which would (probably) consist of face-to-face interviews rather than paper-and-pencil surveying.

Several comments indicated a desire for a more articulated FL/SE program sequence. The observation that "More structure and continuity needed" ought to be considered. In looking at the existing structures, it may be found that there is unintended and unneeded overlap or repetition.

Four sets of teachers comments, given in their entirety below, serve to summarize most of the points made by secondary respondents. They also give much of the "flavor" of teacher sentiment and convey well the strong feelings -- the sense of urgency and commitment -- expressed by numerous respondents. While some repetition results from repeating each in its totality, this may be beneficial as it serves to indicate the areas of consensus.

(1)

I think it must now be the responsibility of the school system to introduce a Sex Education program.

A chaotic situation exists wherein the Public actually is responsible for the results of sexual ignorance and irresponsibility. C.A.S., Public Health, Mental Health, OHIP, Welfare are agencies we have used to deal with the aftermath and all are publicly funded. It seems only logical that Public funds should be used to prevent. I mention finances first as this seems to be the first stumbling block always.

The even more serious problem is that of young people who are physically and emotionally damaged — permanently in many cases.

(2)

It has been my experience that sex education in the secondary schools has been the domain of the physical education departments. Many of these people are only incidentally trained to deal with the important issues involved. The tendency has been and is to dwell on the physical or "mechanical" aspects of birth control, intercourse, sexual maturation, etc. The emotional, moral and legal aspects of romance, marriage, parenthood are generally not well done in my opinion.

The answer is either significantly improved training for teachers — which they must complete before they are allowed to teach sex education, or the soliciting of professional resource people from the community to come into the schools and offer programs to students.

(3)

As a high school teacher, I feel SE should be introduced at a much younger level and continue through high school. Being involved acedemically as well as a guidance counsellor, it is, in my opinion, very easy to see the need for SE at an early age. I state this due to the high pregnancy rate at the junior level in high schools. Too many parents as well as others do not want to accept the reality that their children are sexually active at a very young age (10-12 yrs.)

It is very easy to see why this happens; mainly because we live in a sex orientated society. Young adolescents are hit with sex in books, on the TV, at the show, in magazines, every where they turn. It is only obvious that they are going to try what they see or read.

The problem can no longer have blind eyes turned upon it. It is here, its going to stay and if parents continue to ignore the warning signs, it should be definitely started or reinforced in the schools.

Offer courses for teachers, help them any way you can. If parents still object to this, let them come and teach it or recommend someone who can.

(4)

Discussion of sex education is usually spoken of in euphemistic terms such as "Family Planning" and other terms which tend to be politically and religiously more acceptable than direct terminology.

The human emotional and intangible elements of sexuality and sexual relationships are definitely necessary topics of discussion at all levels of high school classes. However we must be realistically aware that for many students at this age level beliefs and desire have already turned into actions, and modification of such behaviour at this time is difficult and at times futile.

In the face of such circumstance we certainly cannot ignore the moral and emotional implications of sex but we also cannot afford to fail to provide the knowledge by which conception can be prevented. However unpalatable it appears we must accept the fact that many young people are sexually active and provide them with the knowledge to render their sexual activity productive of as little trauma as possible be that physical, emotional or spiritual.

In Part II it was acknowledged that the students are important sources when identifying the needs which should be addressed by SE programming. But the survey neglected to ask teachers about the questions students ask.

This still could be done as a follow-up, or the students themselves could be surveyed. However, other studies have looked at the questions teenagers most commonly ask of doctors and counsellors in educational settings. Until more is known about the specific concerns of teenagers in the York Region, perhaps these, compiled by Dr. Sol Gordon*, are reasonable indicators.

- Is it normal to masturbate?
- Am I masturbating too much?
- Do I have homosexual tendencies?
- Am I abnormal if I have thoughts involving sex with people I know, even members of my family?
- What is a homosexual?
- Are my breasts too small?
- Is the pill safe?
- Is my penis too small?
- How can I get birth control without my parents' knowing about it?
- How can you tell if you have VD?
- Is there something wrong with me if I remain a virgin?
- How can you avoid pregnancy?
- How can I say "no"?
- How can I tell if I'm really in love?
- How can I know if I have an orgasm?
- Is sexual intercourse painful?
- Is oral sex normal?
- What about having sex with someone you're not in love with?
- Where can I get an abortion?
- How can I tell if I'm pregnant?
- How can I enjoy sex more?
- How come I have these unexplained erections?

---

* In Sol Gordon and Irving R. Dickman, Sex education: the parents' role (1977).

Another way of "guessing" at student needs is to look at topics reportedly taught elsewhere, but not written into the topics list by the York County respondents. Herold, for instance, found that the great majority of Ontario secondary school physical and health education teachers and home economics teachers dealt with trial marriage, impotence and frigidity.* Since at least 70 per cent of the Ontario survey respondents said they dealt with these topics, it seems fair to assume there was considerable student interest, concern, or questionning about such matters.

As suggested earlier in this report, student input into program scope and sequence should help produce a meaningful course of studies.

---

* Edward S. Herold, "Sex Education in Ontario Schools. Part II: The Secondary Schools" (mimeo, Univ. of Guelph, 1975)

V. FINDINGS OF THE SURVEY OF SECONDARY PRINCIPALS

The Principals and Their Schools

The principals of the 15 secondary schools were asked to participate in the survey. Completed returns were received from 14. These schools included one which offered programs at the grade 9-11 level and two which currently house grade 8 as well as grade 9-13 students. The non-respondent was new to his position, which may account for the decision not to offer answers and opinions.

Since we are dealing with a population, not a sample as in the elementary principals' survey, there is no question of the generalizability of findings.

Programming Offered

Principals of both the elementary and secondary schools were asked to indicate whether any formal (as distinct from "incidental") SE teaching or counselling was available to their students. It was expected that some elementary principals would indicate no formal SE programming (they would then skip over questions intended to get program details). It was expected that some formal (i.e.,planned) SE programming would be available to all high school students, in health classes for example.

However, two secondary principals did indicate no formal SE programming available. One indication was in error, since there followed the titles of four programs available and the grades at which these were offered. One principal who indicated no programming gave no responses to the questions on the scope and nature of programs. This represents an incorrect answer set. Responses from teachers at all high schools clearly show that planned FL/SE offerings occur in all secondary schools at most grades.

This is shown also in the following tabulation of principals' perceptions.

TABLE 22: Grades at Which SE Programming is Given or Optional *

Grade 8	No. of schools
8	2
9	9
10	10
11	9
12	9
13	3

* 13 principals reporting, but only two schools house grade 8 students

Thirteen principals provided the titles of their schools' SE programs or, as was actually the case since SE does not normally appear as a subject title in its own right, gave the names of the subjects within which SE is offered.

Twelve identified Physical and Health Education at at least three grade levels as dealing with SE. The thirteenth named four program titles (Human Growth and Development, Dating and Maturity, Human Sexuality, and Responsibilities of Marriage) which could be included in part or whole within the PHE guidelines. Four principals identified only PHE as the subject within which SE was covered. This may be under-reportage, but some teacher comments suggest that SE is sometimes viewed as the sole domain of the Health Education teacher.

Seven principals clearly identified Home Economics or Family Studies or both as subject areas dealing with SE, and at least one other infered this. Sometimes specific course titles were given, for instance, Sociology of the Family (grade 13) or Environmental

Studies — Family Planning (grade 11).

Only occasional references were made to other subjects, for example, Science - Reproduction (grade 10) or Man in Society (grade 11).

Participation Rates

This study sought to estimate the percentage of high school students who had or could opt for at least some SE programming. Principals were asked to estimate participation rates at the grade levels (1) pre-grade 9, (2) grades 9-10, (3) grades 11-13.

Eleven principals only provided their best guesses, as arrayed below. It is important to treat each school separately and to see the pattern across the grades for each school. Averages would convey little meaningful information unless we could see the by-school situation.

TABLE 23: Participation Rates as Percentages, By School

School	Grade 8	Grades 9-10	Grades 11-13
A	100%	76%	73%
B	13	23	15
C	NA *	100	30
D	NA	100	60
E	NA	100	60
F	NA	100	95
G	NA	70	49
H	NA	86	82
I	NA	90	60
J	NA	100	70
K	NA	100	70

* NA = Not Applicable

What seems to be suggested is that, with a few exceptions, participation is close to universal at the grade 9-10 level. That is, a student is enrolled at least once in that two-year span in a subject which has a SE component in its program.

All but three respondents report that at least the majority of their grade 11-13 students enroll at least once in a subject which embraces a SE element.

Apart from considerations of the content of the programs, it seems fair to assume that, if SE programming were mandated by the board as a grade 9 or 10 offering (possibly a part of one or more subjects), there would be little change in most schools' participation rate but at least one would undergo a major change (remember: four secondary principals' input is lacking in this tabulation).

Principals' Priorities for SE Topics

Teachers were asked which of 43 FL/SE topics they dealt with. Principals were given the identical list of topics (to which they too could add) and asked to indicate how much priority they would give to each in the various grade groupings in their own school.

The priority scale was High, Medium (Med.), Low, and Not Suitable (NS). The grade groupings were grade 8, grades 9-10, grades 11-13. Since the number of potential respondents varied by grouping (for example, there were only two schools housing grade 8 students) and some gave no response to some items, the figures given are percentages.

TABLE24: Priority Given By Principals to Selected SE Topics, As Percentages

		...for inclusion in grades		
Topic	Priority	8	9-10	11-13
1. Conception and birth	High	0	82	33
	Med.	100	9	33
	Low	0	0	22
	N.S.	0	9	11
2. Heredity and genetics	High	0	18	75
	Med.	0	55	25
	Low	100	27	0
	N.S.	0	0	0
3. Human Sexual Organs	High	0	50	0
	Med.	100	40	29
	Low	0	0	42
	N.S.	0	10	29
4. Puberty	High	50	78	14
	Med.	50	22	29
	Low	0	0	57
	N.S.	0	0	0
5. Gender identity	High	0	40	14
	Med.	0	50	86
	Low	100	0	0
	N.S.	0	10	0
6. Dating	High	0	64	25
	Med.	0	36	50
	Low	100	0	25
	N.S.	0	0	0

(continued)

TABLE 24 (cont'd.)

			...for inclusion in grades		
	Topic	Priority	8	9-10	11-13
7.	Being accepted by significant others	High	0	67	44
		Med.	50	33	56
		Low	50	0	0
		N.S.	0	0	0
8.	Sex outside marriage	High	0	30	33
		Med.	100	40	45
		Low	0	20	22
		N.S.	0	10	0
9.	Venereal disease	High	0	91	86
		Med.	100	9	0
		Low	0	0	14
		N.S.	0	0	0
10.	Unmarried mother	High	0	50	29
		Med.	0	40	71
		Low	100	10	0
		N.S.	0	0	0
11.	Parenthood	High	0	33	90
		Med.	0	56	0
		Low	100	11	10
		N.S.	0	0	0
12.	Parent-child relations	High	50	67	67
		Med.	50	33	22
		Low	0	0	11
		N.S.	0	0	0
13.	Sibling relations	High	50	80	56
		Med.	50	20	33
		Low	0	0	11
		N.S.	0	0	0

(continued)

TABLE 24 (cont'd.)

Topic	Priority	...for inclusion in grades		
		8	9-10	11-13
14. Menstruation	High	100	70	13
	Med.	0	20	13
	Low	0	0	62
	N.S.	0	10	13
15. Masturbation	High	0	36	0
	Med.	0	27	33
	Low	50	36	67
	N.S.	50	0	0
16. Human sexual response	High	0	11	33
	Med.	0	89	67
	Low	100	0	0
	N.S.	0	0	0
17. Youth and the law	High	0	64	38
	Med.	100	36	38
	Low	0	0	25
	N.S.	0	0	0
18. Child molestation	High	0	30	25
	Med.	50	50	50
	Low	50	10	13
	N.S.	0	10	13
19. Pornography	High	0	18	13
	Med.	0	36	50
	Low	100	46	38
	N.S.	0	0	0
20. Homosexuality	High	0	18	13
	Med.	0	46	63
	Low	100	36	25
	N.S.	0	0	0

(continued)

TABLE 24 (cont'd.)

	Topic	Priority	...for inclusion in grades		
			8	9-10	11-13
21.	Alcohol and drug use	High	0	91	63
		Med.	100	9	25
		Low	0	0	13
		N.S.	0	0	0
22.	Leaving Home	High	0	20	33
		Med.	0	40	56
		Low	100	40	11
		N.S.	0	0	0
23.	Choosing a marriage partner	High	0	11	64
		Med.	0	44	36
		Low	100	44	0
		N.S.	0	0	0
24.	Preparation for the wedding	High	0	33	10
		Med.	0	44	70
		Low	100	22	20
		N.S.	0	0	0
25.	Legal aspects of marriage	High	0	11	40
		Med.	0	56	50
		Low	100	33	10
		N.S.	0	0	0
26.	Family economics	High	0	22	70
		Med.	100	44	30
		Low	0	33	0
		N.S.	0	0	0
27.	Factors conducive to a happy marriage	High	0	11	40
		Med.	0	56	50
		Low	100	33	10
		N.S.	0	0	0

(continued)

TABLE 24 (cont'd.)

		...for inclusion in grades		
Topic	Priority	8	9-10	11-13
28. Religion and the family	High	0	0	10
	Med.	0	33	30
	Low	100	44	40
	N.S.	0	22	20
29. Marriage breakdown, counselling	High	0	0	22
	Med.	0	50	67
	Low	100	50	11
	N.S.	0	0	0
30. Family planning concept	High	0	30	50
	Med.	0	50	50
	Low	100	10	0
	N.S.	0	10	0
31. Birth control methods	High	0	40	50
	Med.	100	30	50
	Low	0	20	0
	N.S.	0	10	0
32. Abortion	High	0	36	40
	Med.	0	18	50
	Low	100	36	10
	N.S.	0	9	0
33. Values and lifestyles	High	0	33	30
	Med.	100	56	60
	Low	0	11	10
	N.S.	0	0	0
34. Different kinds of families	High	0	14	38
	Med.	100	71	25
	Low	0	14	38
	N.S.	0	0	0

(continued)

TABLE 24 (con't.)

	Topic	Priority	...for inclusion in grades		
			8	9-10	11-13
35.	Community standards of behaviour	High	0	56	20
		Med.	100	44	70
		Low	0	0	10
		N.S.	0	0	0
36.	Marriage as a social institution	High	0	22	40
		Med.	0	56	60
		Low	100	22	0
		N.S.	0	0	0
37.	The woman in society	High	0	29	38
		Med.	0	81	72
		Low	100	0	0
		N.S.	0	0	0
38.	The physically handicapped	High	0	25	33
		Med.	100	75	56
		Low	0	0	11
		N.S.	0	0	0
39.	Mental health and managing stress	High	0	50	80
		Med.	0	50	20
		Low	100	0	0
		N.S.	0	0	0
40.	Community services offering help in health and family problems	High	0	67	60
		Med.	0	22	20
		Low	100	11	20
		N.S.	0	0	0
41.	The young single adult	High	0	25	67
		Med.	0	50	22
		Low	100	25	11
		N.S.	0	0	0

(continued)

TABLE 24 (cont'd.)

	Topic	Priority	...for inclusion in grades		
			8	9-10	11-13
42.	Theories of personality	High	0	11	11
		Med.	0	56	78
		Low	100	33	11
		N.S.	0	0	0
43.	Sex techniques	High	0	0	0
		Med.	0	10	20
		Low	0	10	0
		N.S.	100	80	80

Some data for this table were "lost", unfortunately, because two respondents used check marks (rather than specifying the priority) with some topics. However, there is a clear enough consensus about many matters and some generalizations can be made about high school principals' priorities for SE programming.

It may interest the reader to compare these priorities with those practices of secondary school FL/SE teachers and guidance counsellors as infered from the topics they deal with (see pages 74-78). Comparison could also be made with elementary school principals' priorities (pages 52-59) and their teachers' practices (pages 18-22).

There are just too many possible comparisons and contrasts to deal with each in this report. And to select just a few runs the risk of indicating that these are the items which should be compared. We can, however, make an initial analysis of those topics on which secondary school principals tend to see eye-to-eye.

There was, for instance, only one topic for which virtually all gave a ""Not Suitable" indication. This was for topic 43, "Sex techniques". One of the reasons this study was undertaken was a concern (sparked by what is now believed to be a case of "sensational journalism") that schools were showing children how to jump into bed together. ("Sex training" would be a more suitable term than "Sex education" were this the case).

Elementary principals shared the view of their high school colleagues. Teachers in both elementary and secondary schools report that (with one or two exceptions) "Sex techniques" is not a topic dealt with.

While elementary principals found many topics which a considerable number (not always the majority) thought "Not Suitable", the secondary principals generally saw 42 of the 43 given topics as having some priority, even if only low. Other than "Sex techniques" only topic 28 "Religion and the family" seemed unsuitable to more than two respondents.

Since considerably greater numbers also gave this topic low priority, it is easy to jump to the conclusion that there is a sentiment against the intrusion of religion into the schoolhouse. There is other evidence to support this conclusion, as noted elsewhere. However, we must also look at the evidence that topics dealing with the family (including marriage) generally receive low priority -- and even "Not Suitable" ratings -- from a certain number of high school principals.

There is clear indication that topics of the "Facts of Life" sort of drop in priority by or after grades 9-10. Teaching "the plumbing" (for example "Human Sexual Organs" and "Conception and Birth") may have been well-enough done before high school. In any case, principals do not see such matters as high priority.

Topics which rise significantly in priority for the senior years are, perhaps, predictable:

leaving home
the young single adult
choosing a marriage partner
family economics
factors conducive to a happy marriage

marriage as a social institution
legal aspects of marriage
family planning concept
birth control methods
abortion
heredity and genetics
parenthood
sex outside marriage
theories of personality
mental health and managing stress

It may surprise some to discover that these topics fall off notably in priority at the grade 11 - 13 level:

dating
being accepted by significant others
venereal disease
masturbation
youth and the law
alcohol and drug use
different kinds of families
community standards of behavior

Principals' Views on Scope, Organization, Needs, and Outcomes of SE

The same 15 statements were put to all respondents in this survey. Respondents were invited to show how strongly they agreed or disagreed with these assertions about SE's scope and focus (items #1, 5, 7, 10), on the organization and manner of presentation of SE programming (#4, 6, 9, 11), on teachers' needs (#2, 3, and 9 again), on the reactions of students and parents to SE (#8, 12), and on the outcomes of SE.

As before, comparisons can be made with the views of the other respondent groups, and possible explanations of differences sought. This part of the report, however, will restrict itself to presenting the tabulations of secondary principals' views and considering what these mean for those concerned with evaluating present conditions as a prelude to improving matters.

TABLE 25: Principals' Views on Selected Aspects of SE, As Percentages

Key: SA/SD = Strongly Agree/Disagree N = Neither Agree Nor Disagree
TA/TD = Tend to Agree/Disagree NR = No Response

	Statements	SA	TA	N	TD	SD	NR
1.	SE is a necessary subject for students at all grades	29	14	7	36	14	0
2.	There is a need for more teacher in-service training	50	36	14	0	0	0
3.	There is a need for more SE instructional materials	36	50	7	7	0	0
4.	SE should be interdisciplinary and should be integrated with other programs	21	57	7	14	0	0
5.	The main focus in SE should be on living rather than sex	57	29	14	0	0	0
6.	SE should not be a school subject; it should be handled by sex counselling and incidental teaching	0	14	14	21	50	0
7.	Give SE as early as possible	14	29	29	14	14	0
8.	The SE program is misunderstood by parents and lacks support	14	36	21	29	0	0
9.	There is a need for smaller classes for SE discussion	0	36	50	7	7	0
10.	Morals, religion should be emphasized in SE	0	21	14	21	36	7
11.	SE should be given to boys and girls together	21	50	14	7	7	0
12.	Students are very receptive and sensible about SE	29	58	14	0	0	0

TABLE 25 (cont'd.)

	Statements	SA	TA	N	TD	SD	NR
13.	SE programming significantly increases students' knowledge	21	64	14	0	0	0
14.	As a result of SE programming, students show more liberal attitudes on sex	0	14	36	43	7	0
15.	Students' behaviours are more responsible as a result of SE programming	14	36	43	7	0	0

On the scope and focus of SE (items #1, 5, 7, and 10) secondary principals were clearly divided on the proposition that SE "is a necessary subject for students at all grades". Fifty per cent rejected this compared with 28 per cent of elementary principals. Forty-three per cent of the high school principals thought SE should begin as early as possible, the same percentage as saw SE as necessary at all levels. None disagreed with the view that "The main focus in SE should be on living rather than sex" and the majority rejected an emphasis on "Morals, religion". Once again, the write-ins indicated that morals were an acceptable dimension of SE, but religion was not.

On organization and manner of presentation (4, 6, 9, and 11), only two respondents (14 per cent) disagreed with the interdisciplinary and integrated approach to SE and only the same number agreed to the proposition that SE should be handled by counselling or incidental teaching rather than as a school subject. Half the principals declined to judge whether smaller classes were needed, but 36 per cent thought classes too large presently for SE discussions. Only two respondents disagreed with the statement that "SE should be given to boys and girls together".

On the matter of teachers' needs (items #2, 3, 9), there was only one principal in disagreement with the two views that (1) more teacher in-service SE training, and (2) more SE instructional materials are needed. As might have been predicted, principals' opinion differs from their teachers' views on class size.

On the reactions of students and parents to SE (items 12 and 8 respectively), only four principals (29 per cent) disagreed with the statement that parents do not understand or support SE, but another three could not or would not offer a judgment. None disagreed with the view that "Students are very receptive and sensible about SE", but two principals reserved judgment.

On the evaluation of outcomes (items #13, 14, and 15) principals clearly tend to believe that "SE programming significantly increases students' knowledge". On the hard-to-interpret matter of SE liberalizing attitudes on sex, half the respondents doubt this is an outcome, but five couldn't say. When presented with the statement that "Students' behaviors are more responsible as a result of SE programming", only one principal disagreed, fifty per cent agreed with the statement, and six were on the fence. As noted earlier, the difficulty here may be that the respondents may well not be in a position to observe the behaviors which tell the tale on this matter.

Additional comments from high school principals were not numerous nor were they substantially different from those of their colleagues, as reported earlier in this document.

One principal tied together some thoughts found on many of the completed surveys. His sentiments may serve as a fitting conclusion to this report.

I have had a good deal of difficulty responding to the opinion portion of the questionnaire because ideally, I do not believe that moral/sexual values can be handled well by teachers in a society where there is such a multiplicity of contradictory value systems in existence. No one teacher can reflect that complexity successfully unless he fence-sits; a useless position for the typical adolescent who is looking for guidance in this area. Ideally, SE should be handled by knowledgeable, secure and loving parents.

In practice, however, it is clear that adolescents continue to be misinformed, and morally confused despite our much discussed sexually open society. Thus, it seems that if there is any source of help for our children it is, by default, the schools.

Given this reality, I believe we should step in early and completely with a program that slightly leads the students' present need for knowledge (forewarned is forearmed) and that it should include everything from "plumbing" to "values" as required by each age level from K-13. The program should be completely visable to all interested parents and should be optional so that parents who can do the job at home (or feel they can) have the option of doing so. I would like to emphasize, however, that this alternative is second-best in my opinion.

APPENDIX "A"
SEX EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Survey of Teachers

I. Please circle the grade (or grade equivalents) in your school.

K 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13

II. Please draw a line through each grade (or grade equivalent) listed above which you teach.

III. Please indicate the nature of the Sex Education (SE) programming you offer your students by CHECKING (√) the item below which best describes your approach.

1. Planned as a distinct program of instruction ____
2. A planned program, but integrated into one or more units of another subject or program ____
3. Taught "incidentally", as need arises, or at a "teachable moment" ____
4. Basically "hit-and-miss" ____

IV. Please indicate by a CHECK (√) each of the following topics which you usually include in your program(s), using the columns to indicate at which level these topics are dealt with. Add other topics in your program(s) which relate fairly closely to those in the list. Write in "B" or "G" if topic is taught to boys only or girls only.

	Grades				
Topic	K-2	3-5	6-8	9/[illegible]	11/13
1. Conception and birth					
2. Heredity and genetics					
3. Human sexual organs					
4. Puberty					
5. Gender identity or sex roles					
6. Dating and going steady					

...../2

IV. (continued)

	Grades				
Topic	K-2	3-5	6-8	9/10	11/13
7. Being accepted by significant others					
8. Sex outside of marriage					
9. Venereal diseases					
10. The unmarried mother					
11. Parenthood and child care					
12. Parent - child relations					
13. Sibling relations					
14. Menstruation					
15. Masturbation					
16. Human sexual response					
17. Youth and the law					
18. Child molestation					
19. Pornography					
20. Homosexuality					
21. Alcohol and drug use					
22. Leaving home, setting up home					
23. Choosing a marriage partner					
24. Preparation for the wedding					
25. Legal aspects of marriage					
26. Family economics					
27. Factors conducive to a happy marriage					

...../3

IV. (continued)

	Grades				
Topic	K-2	3-5	6-8	9/10	11/13
28. Religion and the family					
29. Marriage breakdown, counselling					
30. Family planning concept					
31. Birth control methods					
32. Abortion					
33. Values and lifestyles					
34. Different kinds of families					
35. Community standards of behaviour					
36. Marriage as a social institution					
37. The woman in society					
38. The physically handicapped					
39. Mental health and managing stress					
40. Community services offering help in health and family problems					
41. The young single adult					
42. Theories of personality					
43. Sex techniques					
44.					
45.					
46.					

...../4

V. How much time (minutes per month) is usually given to SE in the grade(s) you teach?

K-2 ______ minutes per month

3-5 ______

6-8 ______

9-10 ______

11-13 ______

VI. (Secondary school teachers only to answer.)

What is the approximate "mix" of students in the SE program(s) which you teach?

Advanced level ____%

General level ____%

Other ____%

VII. Have you taken any formal training in SE? Yes ____ No ____

If "Yes", please name or describe the course(s) or program(s). (State by which institution training given; undergraduate/graduate/preservice/inservice? duration? diploma or degree or credit obtained? year(s) when taken? etc.)

____

____

____

____

____

____

____

...../5

VIII. How comfortable do you feel about the SE program(s) you teach? CHECK (✓) ONE.

Very comfortable ____
Generally comfortable ____
Uncomfortable ____
Very uncomfortable ____

If "(Very) uncomfortable", please briefly explain why.

____

____

____

IX. Please CHECK (✓) each of the following Ministry or other guidelines or policies you use as the basis (bases) of your SE program(s).

1. The Formative Years ____
2. Family Studies, Intermediate Division ____
3. Home Economics, Senior Division ____
4. Physical & Health Education, Intermediate Division ____
5. Physical & Health Education, Senior Division ____
6. Man in Society, Intermediate Division ____
7. Other Ministry guide [name(s): ____

____

____]

8. Locally devised curriculum guideline(s) [name(s): ____

____

____]

9. Other (please describe) ____

____

____

...../6

X. 1. If you taught SE prior to this year, CHECK (✓) HERE ____. Otherwise go to XI.

2. Then please indicate (by occupation, if possible) the types of resource persons you have used, such as social worker, doctor, priest, marriage counsellor, lawyer, public health nurse.

a. ____________________ e. ____________________

b. ____________________ f. ____________________

c. ____________________ g. ____________________

d. ____________________ h. ____________________

3. Please state briefly why you used these resource persons and whether their use met your goals.

____

____

____

____

____

XI. 1. These questions relate to the resource materials you are using or plan to use this year in any ONE SE program, unit, or series of lessons (elementary teachers of one grade only answer with respect to that grade). If you do not plan to do any SE programming, CHECK (✓) HERE ____ and go to XIV.

2. Please indicate the grade levels of this year's program by circling:

K-2, 3-5, 6-8, 9-10, 11-13

...../7

XI. 3. Please list text(s) and major supplementary references to be used in this program.

	Title, Author, Publisher	In Ministry guideline, approved by board or on Circular 14? Yes/No
(a)		
(b)		
(c)		
(d)		

4. Please describe, reasonably fully, up to THREE other teaching aids used in this program.

...../8

XII. Please describe briefly how parents are informed of the SE program(s) you teach.

XIII. Briefly, what kinds of reactions to your SE program are you getting from

1. students

2. parents

XIV. For each of the following statements, please indicate whether you strongly agree (SA), tend to agree (TA), neither agree nor disagree (N), tend to disagree (TD), or strongly disagree (SD). Use CHECK (✓) MARKS.

Statements	SA	TA	N	TD	SD
1. SE is a necessary subject for students at all grades					
2. There is a need for more teacher in-service SE training					
3. There is a need for more SE instructional materials					
4. SE should be interdisciplinary and should be integrated with other programs					

...../9

XIV. (continued)

	Statements	SA	TA	N	TD	SD
5.	The main focus in SE should be on living rather than sex					
6.	SE should not be a school subject; it should be handled by sex counselling and incidental teaching					
7.	Give SE as early as possible					
8.	The SE program is misunderstood by parents and lacks support					
9.	There is a need for smaller classes for SE discussion					
10.	Morals, religion should be emphasized in SE					
11.	SE should be given to boys and girls together					
12.	Students are very receptive and sensible about SE					
13.	SE programming significantly increases students' knowledge					
14.	As a result of SE programming, students show more liberal attitudes on sex					
15.	Students' behaviours are more responsible as a result of SE programming					

...../10

XV. Thank you for your responses.

Feel free to add any observations on SE programming which you think important.

APPENDIX "B"

SEX EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Survey of Principals

I. Please circle the grades (or grade equivalents) in your school.

K 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13

II. If no formal* SE programming of any sort is available to any of your students, please CHECK (✓) HERE _____ and go to item VI (*"incidental" teaching or counselling, for this survey, is not considered formal programming.)

III. Please circle the grades at which SE programming is given or optional.

K 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13

IV. Estimate the percentage of students in your school who have SE programming in the following grade level groupings.

K-2 _____% 3-5 _____% 6-8 _____% 9-10 _____% 11-13 _____%

V. E. (Elementary school principals only)

If your SE programs or the courses of which they are part have official names or titles, please give these and indicate the grade(s) covered by each.

V. S. (Secondary school principals only: consultation with guidance, health, social sciences, and home economics department heads may be required)

Please give the title (if one exists) of each SE program available, or name the subject the program falls within: specify the grade(s) at which the SE program is offered.

____

____

____

____

____

____

...../2

VI. Please indicate how much priority *you* would give to having each of the following topics included somewhere in programs offered at your school. Use this scale: H, M, L, NS for high, medium, low priority, or "not suitable" for the given grade (or grade equivalent) groupings. Answer only for those grade groupings in your school.

	Grades				
Topic	K-2	3-5	6-8	9/10	11/13
1. Conception and birth					
2. Heredity and genetics					
3. Human sexual organs					
4. Puberty					
5. Gender identity or sex roles					
6. Dating and going steady					
7. Being accepted by significant others					
8. Sex outside of marriage					
9. Venereal diseases					
10. The unmarried mother					
11. Parenthood and child care					
12. Parent - child relations					
13. Sibling relations					
14. Menstruation					
15. Masturbation					
16. Human sexual response					
17. Youth and the law					
18. Child molestation					
19. Pornography					

.....3

VI. (continued)

	Grades				
Topic	K-2	3-5	6-8	9/10	11/13
20. Homosexuality					
21. Alcohol and drug use					
22. Leaving home, setting up home					
23. Choosing a marriage partner					
24. Preparation for the wedding					
25. Legal aspects of marriage					
26. Family economics					
27. Factors conducive to a happy marriage					
28. Religion and the family					
29. Marriage breakdown, counselling					
30. Family planning concept					
31. Birth control methods					
32. Abortion					
33. Values and lifestyles					
34. Different kinds of families					
35. Community standards of behaviour					
36. Marriage as a social institution					
37. The woman in society					
38. The physically handicapped					
39. Mental health and managing stress					
40. Community services offering help in health and family problems					

...../4

VI. (continued)

	Groups				
Topic	K-2	3-5	6-8	9/10	11/13
41. The young single adult					
42. Theories of personality					
43.					
44.					
45.					
46.					

VII. For each of the following statements, please indicate whether you strongly agree (SA), tend to agree (TA), neither agree nor disagree (N), tend to disagree (TD), or strongly disagree (SD). Use CHECK (√) MARKS.

Statements	SA	TA	N	TD	SD
1. SE is a necessary subject for students at all grades					
2. There is a need for more teacher inservice SE training					
3. There is a need for more SE instructional materials					
4. SE should be interdisciplinary and should be integrated with other programs					
5. The main focus in SE should be on living rather than sex					
6. SE should not be a school subject; it should be handled by sex counselling and incidental teaching					
7. Give SE as early as possible					

...../5

VII. (continued)

	Statements	SA	TA	N	TD	SD
8.	The SE program is misunderstood by parents and lacks support					
9.	There is a need for smaller classes for SE discussion					
10.	Morals, religion should be emphasized in SE					
11.	SE should be given to boys and girls together					
12.	Students are very receptive and sensible about SE					
13.	SE programming significantly increases students' knowledge					
14.	As a result of SE programming, students show more liberal attitudes on sex.					
15.	Students' behaviours are more responsible as a result of SE programming					

VIII. Thank you for your responses.

Feel free to add any observations on SE programming which you think important.

APPENDIX "C"

BOOKS REPORTED TO BE USED BY TEACHERS AND COUNSELLORS IN THE TEACHING/COUNSELLING OF FAMILY LIFE AND SEX EDUCATION*

1. Adolescents In Society
E 2. All About Me
E 3. The Bible
4. Birth Control Handbook
5. Birth Control That Works
E 6. Bodies
7. Building A Successful Marriage
8. The Canadian Family
9. The Canadian Family in Comparative Perspective
10. The Canadian Mother and Child
E 11. A Child is Born
12. The Child and Society: The Process of Socialization
13. Child Care and Development
14. Conception: Birth and Contraception
E 15. Concepts in Health
16. Counsellor's Resource Book for Groups in Guidance
17. The Christian View of Sex
18. The Cycles of Sex
19. Dating, Communication and Decision-Making
20. Dialog: Dating and Marriage

E Reported to be used by elementary teachers

* Data on author and publisher were provided by respondents but are omitted from this list due to the great number of titles.

21. Education for Sexuality
22. Education for Sexuality: Concepts and Programs for Teaching
23. Families
24. Families: A Canadian Perspective
25. Family
26. The Family
27. Family Development
28. The Family in Canada
29. The Family In Various Cultures
30. Family Living and Sex Education
31. Family Planning in Canada
32. Future Shock
33. Getting It Together
E 34. Good Apple
35. Good Health
E 36. Good News for Modern Man
37. Growing Up
E 38. Health and Development
39. Health and the Nature of Man
40. Health For All
41. Health Science
E 42. Health, Science and You
43. Homes with Character
44. Human Physiology

45. Human Reproduction, Conception and Contraception

46. The Human Zoo

47. The Individual, Sex and Society

48. In the Interest of Youth-Family Law

49. In the Interest of Youth-Sexuality

50. Introduction to Family Life and Sex Education

E 51. The Life Cycle Library

52. Life Science Library (Series)

53. A Lifetime of Health

54. Living: An Outline

55. Living in Families

56. Love and Life - Fertility and Conception Prevention

57. Man and His Health

58. Marriage and the Family

59. Marriage for Moderns

E 60. Maturing in a Changing World

61. Medical and Health Encyclopedia

62. Modern Sex Education

63. The Naked Ape

64. The Nine Months

65. Our Bodies, Ourselves

E 66. Parents' Guide to Christian Conversation About Sex

67. Patterns For Living

68. Personal Adjustment, Marriage and Family Living

69. Population, Evolution and Birth Control
70. A Practical Manual on Reproduction
E 71. Primarily Me
72. Primary Anatomy
73. Psychology For Living
74. Relationships: A Study in Human Behaviour
75. Scenes From Life: Views on Marriage, Family and Intimacy
76. The Science of Health
77. Sex Education: Teacher's Guide
78. Sex, Sexuality, and Our Changing World
79. Sexual Behavior in Canada
80. Sourcebook in Marriage and The Family
E 81. Take the High Road
82. Teen Horizons
83. These Are Your Children
84. Today's Child
85. Tomorrow is Now
86. Try This on For Size
E 87. Understanding Health (#2, 3, and 4 in the series)
88. Values Clarification: Handbook of Strategies
89. V.D.: The ABC's
90. V.D. Handbook
91. Venereal Disease
92. V.D.: The People to People Disease

93. Your Heredity and Environment

94. Your Marriage and Family Living

95. Women Unite: A Book For Women

E 96. Wonderfully Made

97. Your Erroneous Zones

APPENDIX "D"
FILMS REPORTED TO BE USED BY TEACHERS IN THEIR FAMILY LIFE AND SEX EDUCATION PROGRAMMING

* 1. And They Lived Happily Ever After: Understanding Teenage Marriage

E 2. All About You (videotape)

3. First Four Months

*E 4. Boy To Man

* 5. Coping With Parents

6. Do I Really Want a Baby?

7. Egg and Sperm

* 8. Family Problems

E 9. Free To Be You and Me

* 10. The Game

*E 11. Girl To Woman

* 12. A Half Million Teenagers

* 13. Have A Healthy Baby

* 14. Human Journey: The Early Years

* 15. Human Journey: Marriage

16. Human Sexuality and Communication

* 17. It Couldn't Happen To Me

18. I'm Seventeen and Pregnant

* 19. The Methods of Birth Control

* 20. Methods of Family Planning

21. The Miracle of Birth

* Available from the YCBE Education Resource Centre Film Library
E Reported to be used in elementary schools (some also in secondary schools)

...../2

22. Mommy — Daddy Communication
* 23. Mother Love
* 24. A New Human Life
25. The New Romance
26. No Time Like Now
* 27. Phoebe
* 28. Pregnancy and Birth
29. The Purposes of Birth Control
30. Rockabye Baby
31. So You Want to Have a Baby
32. The Story of Eric
* 33. The Summer We Moved to Elm Street
* 34. The Swimmer (in short version "I Who Am, Who Am I?")
* 35. Teenage Pregnancy
36. Teenage Marriage
* 37. V.D.: Name Your Contacts
*E 38. The World of Three
39. You Haven't Changed a Bit

APPENDIX "E"
FILMSTRIPS REPORTED TO BE USED BY TEACHERS IN THEIR FAMILY LIFE AND SEX EDUCATION PROGRAMMING

1. Family and Sex Education (Series C)
2. Fetal Development
3. Getting Along With the Opposite Sex
4. Human Birth, Growth and Development
5. Human Physiology - Male and Female Reproductive Systems
6. Love and Marriage
7. Loving Relationships
8. The Other Generation
9. The Reproductive System
10. Sexuality
11. Understanding Your Baby

These were reported to be used in the Intermediate and Senior Divisions or in the Special Education and Trainable Mentally Retarded classes for older elementary students.

Filmstrips are normally acquired and kept by schools.

A study done at the Teen Clinic of the Hospital for Sick Children found that 80 per cent of all sexually active teenagers used no birth control at least some of the time.

About 33 per cent of pregnant teen-agers said they never practised birth control, yet 61 per cent said they had adequate knowledge.

Studies made during the past 35 years indicate that between 75 percent and 90 percent of all young people say they've learned most of what they know about sex from their friends; if the figure is slightly lower for girls, it is probably because "mothering" covers at least a discussion with daughters about menstruation. It nothing more.

Week highlights birth control for teen-agers

In Canada this week 1,800 teen-agers will become pregnant, and in Toronto 80 per cent of sexually active teen-agers will not be using birth control methods.

These figures are being used by the family planning services of Toronto's Department of Public He... promo...

School board's whim decides if sex education on curriculum

"let the school do it"

All national surveys reveal that the majority of parents favor sex education in the schools, yet there is clearly still some sentiment in this country against its inclusion in school curricula. At this

1,863 teen-agers pregnant and 923 had abortions, study says

By JOAN HOLLOBON

Nearly 2,000 Toronto teen-agers became pregnant in 1976, 29 of them under 14 years old, Dr. Peter Cole, director of the Family Planning Services of the city's Public Health Department, said yesterday.

Dr. Cole said of the total 1,863 pregnancies, 923 girls had legal abortions, ... had live babies ... illbirths ...

"It is recognized, as a matter of public policy, that this conduct did not violate the mores of the 20th century. Today, sexual intercourse is recognized as the normal conduct in the development of a human being. As a result, this subject is taught to children in the pub... schools."

The "new morality" has prompted and, in some cases, forced school boards to provide students with some kind of program that would prepare them for life in our permissive society. The usual title for these programs is Family Life Education, but a variety of other titles apply also: Perspectives for Living, Christian Family Life, Becoming a Person, Human and Social Development, Life Skills, and so on. A wide variety of topics in the areas of self-management, interpersonal relations, and personal philosophy are dealt with in Famil...

Earlier sexual activity

Wherever that elsewhere is—and it is most likely to be the street and the media—come disquieting statistics indicate there is something very wrong with the "information" young people are getting. While they do not appear to know more than their parents knew, the evidence is that they do more, that they are more sexually active, on the whole than their parents were.

"The challenge is immense, but it is clear that adults are in no position to criticize youth for irresponsible sexual behavior until they are more responsible, and in turn pass onto adolescents concrete ways to be responsible."

Even where schools provide sex education, that does not appear to alter the picture very much. Most such programs are not offered until the tenth and eleventh grades; but a study by Brother Urban H. Fleege (cited by Father Henry Sattler in *Parents, Children, and the Facts of Life*) found that with regard to the "sexual mechanism," "68 percent of boys receive enlightenment from companions in the seventh grade, and most girls learn the facts about sex in the sixth grade"—between ages 11 and 13.

Teens taught birth control in high

There is no way a parent can avoid being the principal sex educator of his or her child—whether the parent is open and candid about sex, or says nothing at all.

Before their first day of school, children have learned not only the specific information about sex their parents have given them, but also the attitudes with which their parents have reacted. "We

THE YORK COUNTY
BOARD OF EDUCATION